

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

BULLETIN

Vol. VIII

March, 1922

No. 3

**The Proceedings of the Eighth
Annual Meeting**

Edited by
Robert L. Kelly
Executive Secretary of the Association

Published by
THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

**January, February, March, April, May, November
and December**

Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 75 cents
Application made for admission as second-class matter at the
Post Office of New York, N. Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COLLEGE OBJECTIVES AND IDEALS.....	57
PRESIDENT LUCIA R. BRIGGS	
CHANCELLOR J. H. KIRKLAND	
PRESIDENT ELLEN F. PENDLETON	
PRESIDENT E. M. HOPKINS	
THE UNIVERSITY AND THE AMERICAN WORKER	75
SPENCER MILLER, JR.	
REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACA- DEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE	94
DEAN CHARLES N. COLE	
REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SABBATIC LEAVE	104
DEAN OTIS E. RANDALL	
EDUCATION FOR SYMMETRY	118
PRESIDENT ARTHUR E. MORGAN	
REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COM- MISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP	127
PRESIDENT F. C. FERRY	
THE CONGREGATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION	135
PRESIDENT DONALD J. COWLING	
LIMITATION OF ENROLLMENT IN COLLEGES	142
DEAN HOWARD McCLENAHAN	
PROFESSOR C. MILDRED THOMPSON	
PRESIDENT E. M. HOPKINS	
THE RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS	162
DR. GEORGE F. ZOOK	
PROFESSORIAL SALARIES.....	178
DR. JOHN J. TIGERT, Commissioner of Education of the United States.	

COMMISSIONS

College Architecture

- J. H. T. Main, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, Chairman.
D. J. Cowling, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.
F. C. Ferry, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York.
W. W. Guth, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.
T. C. Burgess, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Illinois.

Organization of College Curriculum

- R. L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City, Chairman.
Alexander Meiklejohn, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Clyde Furst, Carnegie Foundation, New York City.
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.
George F. Zook, Specialist in Higher Education, Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.
W. E. Smyser, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

Distribution of Colleges

- S. P. Capen, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.
R. M. Hughes, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
J. L. McConaughy, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
E. M. Hopkins, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.
M. A. Brannon, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin.

Faculty and Student Scholarship

- F. C. Ferry, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, Chairman.
E. E. Brown, New York University, New York City.
F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.
Samuel Plantz, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin.
Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
J. H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania.

Objectives and Ideals

- C. A. Richmond, Union University, Schenectady, New York, *ex-officio*, Chairman.
R. B. Ogilby, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut.
J. L. Blaisdell, Pomona College, Claremont, California.
Ellen F. Pendleton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.
H. L. Smith, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia.
A. W. Harris, Board of Education, M. E. Church, New York City.
W. G. Clippinger, Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio.

Sabbatical Leave

- O. E. Randall, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, Chairman.
H. N. MacCracken, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York.
W. D. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
C. A. Richmond, Union University, Schenectady, New York.
J. S. Nollen, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

Academic Freedom

- C. N. Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Chairman.
J. W. Mauck, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan.
R. C. Flickinger, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
H. M. Gage, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
W. J. Hutchins, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky.

Publications

- C. A. Richmond, Union University, Schenectady, New York.
R. L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

COLLEGE OBJECTIVES AND IDEALS

PRESIDENT LUCIA BRIGGS, MILWAUKEE-DOWNER COLLEGE

I feel especially hesitant in speaking here to-night before you on the subject of "College Objectives and Ideals," because I am very new in my work at Milwaukee-Downer College, because I am very decidedly, as yet, a "freshman president."

Practically every definition of education states that education should be a preparation for life, though the definitions vary in wording of that thought. With the growing complexity of modern life, various types of education and of institutions of learning have sprung up and the curriculum in these institutions has suddenly changed and broadened. Then, too, undergraduate activities have developed greatly and though they at times cause trouble, they have proved their worth in the development of poise, initiative, tact, and judgment. With such a bewildering and fascinating array of subjects in connection with education it is particularly necessary, I think, in talking of education to emphasize the fundamentals, to emphasize pure scholarship. I am conservative enough to believe very strongly in the value of the classics as a background in liberal education. It is important, too, I believe, to emphasize the value of hard work, in contrast with the type of education much talked of lately, a type which has been described as education in which "thanks shall take the place of spans"; to emphasize the value of the student's learning to accept routine, as a matter of course, since no one can escape routine; to emphasize the value and the glory of mental achievement after struggle; and in these days, when many people are talking about the development of the individual and the freedom of the individual, to foster in colleges whatever makes for the development of an intelligent sense of responsibility. And, finally, I wish to quote from President Faunce:

"The problem before our colleges is to return to the

original idea of education, as fundamental equipment for vocation, but so to interpret vocation as to preserve for the college broad horizons, generous sympathies, insight into the best that the world has said or done, and profound religious faith."

DR. J. H. KIRKLAND, CHANCELLOR OF VANDERBILT
UNIVERSITY

I desire to acknowledge the very great courtesy and the very great service rendered the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States at its meeting two months ago when the Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges, Dr. Kelly, paid us a visit and delivered a very illuminating address on "Studies of the College Curriculum." I cannot hope to repay the service that he rendered in the remarks I shall make tonight. I desire, therefore, to make full acknowledgment of our abiding indebtedness and of the courtesy shown.

The subject that has been assigned to me tonight is fairly broad. It is difficult to define college ideals in any way that will be universally accepted. Social ideals vary. They are not the same in Main Street and in Broadway. They are not the same in the different classes of any one community. There were a thousand speakers who undertook during the war to define the ideals of America, yet they did not deliver the same message. College ideals as defined by the faculty differ from those cherished by students, by alumni, and by the world at large. In my remarks tonight perhaps I represent more nearly the views of the faculty than of any other class.

Negatively I may say that the ideals of the college are not those of the professional school, nor of the graduate school, nor of the institution for research. The ideals of the college as I see them must be expressed in terms of universal human life. If I may analyze my subject

more closely I would say that the ministry of the college must have an intellectual basis, a social tendency, and a spiritual outlook. Under these three groups I can arrange all the activities of college life.

The intellectual basis comes first, first in time, and first in importance. The college has really no justification for existence unless it can furnish that. If a student wants social life he can find it in his club without coming to college. No social or moral or religious advantages can be a substitute for earnest, intense, intellectual work.

I sometimes feel that we have been misled by a weak sentimentality. We hear much of the worthy student who ought not to be deprived of the advantages of an education and who ought to have the college doors opened to him in spite of all possible deficiencies. No doubt there should be opportunities for any boy or girl who wants an education, but colleges have a more definite mission. They are designed for a definite type of individual development. They are not made to be houses of refuge for the unprepared and unfit. In the past we have sometimes made our own work contemptible because we have not been willing to enforce the standards of intellectual achievement that we profess to believe in. No young man ought to be kept in college unless his work is satisfactory. We spend too much time looking after conditioned students, students on probation, and taking care of general derelicts. These things consume our endowment and we are wearing out the life of our professors. Colleges were made for something better. They were made for students who can walk the lonely path of intellectual life, and those who do not want to walk that path should make place for others waiting. A large percentage, possibly one-half, of the students in our colleges remain there in spite of inefficiency that would cost them their jobs in any respectable business house.

My second contention is that the college must have a social tendency. No man lives for himself alone. Man

original idea of education, as fundamental equipment for vocation, but so to interpret vocation as to preserve for the college broad horizons, generous sympathies, insight into the best that the world has said or done, and profound religious faith."

DR. J. H. KIRKLAND, CHANCELLOR OF VANDERBILT
UNIVERSITY

I desire to acknowledge the very great courtesy and the very great service rendered the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States at its meeting two months ago when the Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges, Dr. Kelly, paid us a visit and delivered a very illuminating address on "Studies of the College Curriculum." I cannot hope to repay the service that he rendered in the remarks I shall make tonight. I desire, therefore, to make full acknowledgment of our abiding indebtedness and of the courtesy shown.

The subject that has been assigned to me tonight is fairly broad. It is difficult to define college ideals in any way that will be universally accepted. Social ideals vary. They are not the same in Main Street and in Broadway. They are not the same in the different classes of any one community. There were a thousand speakers who undertook during the war to define the ideals of America, yet they did not deliver the same message. College ideals as defined by the faculty differ from those cherished by students, by alumni, and by the world at large. In my remarks tonight perhaps I represent more nearly the views of the faculty than of any other class.

Negatively I may say that the ideals of the college are not those of the professional school, nor of the graduate school, nor of the institution for research. The ideals of the college as I see them must be expressed in terms of universal human life. If I may analyze my subject

more closely I would say that the ministry of the college must have an intellectual basis, a social tendency, and a spiritual outlook. Under these three groups I can arrange all the activities of college life.

The intellectual basis comes first, first in time, and first in importance. The college has really no justification for existence unless it can furnish that. If a student wants social life he can find it in his club without coming to college. No social or moral or religious advantages can be a substitute for earnest, intense, intellectual work.

I sometimes feel that we have been misled by a weak sentimentality. We hear much of the worthy student who ought not to be deprived of the advantages of an education and who ought to have the college doors opened to him in spite of all possible deficiencies. No doubt there should be opportunities for any boy or girl who wants an education, but colleges have a more definite mission. They are designed for a definite type of individual development. They are not made to be houses of refuge for the unprepared and unfit. In the past we have sometimes made our own work contemptible because we have not been willing to enforce the standards of intellectual achievement that we profess to believe in. No young man ought to be kept in college unless his work is satisfactory. We spend too much time looking after conditioned students, students on probation, and taking care of general derelicts. These things consume our endowment and we are wearing out the life of our professors. Colleges were made for something better. They were made for students who can walk the lonely path of intellectual life, and those who do not want to walk that path should make place for others waiting. A large percentage, possibly one-half, of the students in our colleges remain there in spite of inefficiency that would cost them their jobs in any respectable business house.

My second contention is that the college must have a social tendency. No man lives for himself alone. Man

does not begin to live until he lives for others. Plato defined man as a social being, yet we have only recently discovered this truth and tried to practice it.

During the great world war the question asked of every science was what it could do to win the war. This question was asked of Chemistry, of Physics, of Mathematics, and of Languages. Knowledge that could not be applied to this great objective was considered of little worth. The demands of peace are no less exacting than those of war. Knowledge should be not only enjoyable but useful for promoting human weal, for developing character, for building civilization, and for making a new world in times of peace as we were then trying to destroy the world in a time of war.

The social sciences and the physical sciences seem to be now the central point of the college curriculum. Students are seeking these subjects because they are easily applied to life, but the same application of knowledge to life can be and ought to be made in the case of every other subject in the curriculum.

The social tendency of college life is apparent in all the extra curriculum activities of the college. From the standpoint of the student these are the really important things. I suppose there is many a boy in college who would prefer a sweater with a letter on it to a Phi Beta Kappa key, and who would rather manage some club than lead his class. The opinion of students regarding these things is indicated in their own language. They call these things college activities. Their studies I presume ought to be called college passivities. The natural attitude of the student being one of repose, he becomes active only when he goes on the athletic field or to the fraternity house. I do not claim that these things are unimportant. If they form so large a part of the life of every student, the faculty should take notice of them. They are the things that are longest remembered. There would be few college songs written or sung were it not for this wealth of college life. No poetic or musical

inspiration lingers around Freshman Latin or Senior Philosophy. In view of these facts college faculties must see to it that this life in miniature led by the students should be directed along educative and helpful lines and promote this social tendency of which I am speaking. There is room here for more guidance, more assistance, more sympathetic help which can be rendered through the President, or the Dean, or the Dean of Students, or Faculty Committees. My point is that it must be rendered in some way by the college organization, for nothing is unimportant in which students are so deeply concerned.

My last suggestion I present very briefly. Before this audience I do not need to emphasize the importance of the spiritual outlook. This part of my theme does not refer specifically to the field of religion, for the field of religion compasses also the intellectual life and the social life. I may paraphrase my theme and express the three-fold division of my subject by shifting the phraseology. The intellectual life means knowing. The social life means doing. The spiritual outlook means being. This spiritual outlook is an expression of life in its highest forms and phases. It is more than knowing and more than doing. If the college fails in promoting among its students a spiritual outlook, this attitude of mind and heart will vanish from our civilization. Here is the supreme duty of the teacher, and here is the glory that makes every teacher's chair radiant with possible influence. Here the distinction of the small college and the great college is wiped out. This inspirational work is the hardest part of the teacher's work. You can get a dozen men to teach a class in Shakespeare, if that means enumerating his editions and variant readings, but where is the man that can really teach Shakespeare? To teach the philosophy of History is something far more than to teach the facts of History. The college wants an astronomer who can calculate the orbits of the planets, but also one who has learned and can teach that the Heavens

declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork.

Our President remarked in his address that the facts of Science were changing rapidly, and that the teachings of Physics today were very different from the teachings a generation ago. We admit all this, but we take refuge in the further fact that there are phases of truth that do not change. There is a beauty that is everlasting; there are duties that are ever present, and love and service are as eternal as life. The recognition of these things, and the acceptance of these ideals, is the finest product of college culture.

PRESIDENT PENDLETON, WELLESLEY COLLEGE

I am sure that you all give me your sympathy in speaking to you about college objectives and ideals after the last speaker. I, too, felt how difficult it would be for any one of us to voice any fresh truths or give any fresh ideas to a community that is constantly considering college objectives and ideals, and when I knew that I was to follow Chancellor Kirkland, I was more despairing of being able to give to you anything more than a few commonplace remarks.

I assume that, in spite of the very interesting historical review of colleges in this country which our President has given to us, we do not care to consider tonight college curricula, nor college requirements, nor new methods of testing the qualifications of candidates for admission to colleges, nor any of that skeleton organization which makes up the college administration, but rather that we want to give our minds for just a few moments to what really is common to us all, the college objectives and the college ideals; and because so much has been said and so well said about them, I intend to say but very little, simply to rehearse some things which you have already heard many times, and which, probably, will not come to you even in any fresh way.

I suppose a real college's objective is to make its students useful citizens. Now, I use the term "useful," not in a materialistic sense, but in the sense of service to one's fellowmen. I assume, therefore, that all colleges seek to turn out graduates who will be useful members of our republic, who are trained to give rather than to receive. I assume, therefore, that one of the first things which a college must do is to provide such conditions that every student will be able to discover his own power, and having discovered it, to develop it to its utmost.

I assume, also, that one of the great ideals of a college is to train its students, so to provide a faculty—a very difficult thing to do, as Chancellor Kirkland has said—that students will be convinced that the great responsibility which the student has is to develop the power which has been given to him, and that the greater that power, that natural endowment, the greater the responsibility of the student to develop and make use of it. I think we sometimes forget to impress upon our students that the responsibility for obtaining knowledge, that the responsibility for developing power, is a responsibility of the student and not so much the responsibility of the faculty; that we should, further, if possible, convince our students that there is no royal road to learning; that however richly endowed by nature a student may be there is no substitute for sustained and intelligent effort. I suppose that we all realize, as has been said time and time again by our great captains of industry and by our statesmen, that America needs an increase of production, some great force which will make the people work.

Now, I suppose also that we ought to convince our students that the greatest thing which they must do in college is to learn to set up, or rather, perhaps I should use the phrase to establish that intellectual basis to which Chancellor Kirkland referred, that nothing can be substituted for honest intellectual work. We ought,

also, if we can, and I believe we can—I believe that our students are more ready to receive it than we think they are—we ought, I say, to convince our students that the greatest joy that exists in life—at least one of the greatest joys that exists in life—is intellectual effort. After all it is one of the ways in which man is differentiated from beasts, this power of intellectual effort, and there is joy in seeing and feeling that one's own mind is working out problems, and getting results which can not be obtained in any other way.

There is also another ideal which, of course, is a commonplace one, but which always needs to be emphasized. It is the ideal of setting before our students the fact that education is a great unfinished task; that it is always going to be unfinished. Last summer some of us saw the marvelous pageant at Plymouth and were refreshed in our memory of what Robinson said when he gave his last address to his followers, that they should be ready for the truth which was to come, a greater, finer and higher truth than they had yet received. Even then, more than three hundred years ago, he believed that the end of truth was not settled and that within the Scriptures there was to come greater and finer truth, and they should get ready for it.

Now, when I think of the greatest ideals that we have to set before our students, I am convinced that one is that no matter how much they have worked in college, no matter how much they are conscious of greater knowledge, greater attainments, no matter how much they are interested in tiny business affairs of the world's knowledge to which they have given special attention, nevertheless the richest and finest inheritance they are yet to get comes in after education, that vital, living thing which ever goes on, and is never done, and lasts as long as life itself. I suppose that is one of the reasons why, as we look forward to this great country of ours and wish for it the finest place that can ever be given to any nation, one of a group of great nations, all working

together for the advancement of mankind—that is why we crave for the young people that we are sending out from our colleges that liberal spirit which shall find new things to grasp, new ideas to assimilate, new truths to comprehend as the days go on into later life, a kind of liberal spirit which can be liberal and can be progressive because it is established upon a great spiritual and religious faith. I mean the kind of spiritual and religious faith that is not attached to any particular creed, but is at the foundation of a life which is serene because it is secure in the things which are not temporal but spiritual.

In 1920 Wellesley College had the good fortune to have as a Commencement speaker the present Secretary of State. I can not close what I have said tonight any better than to give you the last paragraph of Mr. Hughes' Commencement address at Wellesley. I suppose one of the reasons why he was kind enough to come to us was because his daughter was receiving her degree that year. His subject was "The Patriotism of Peace," and he closed his address with the definition of the liberal spirit with which I shall close what I have to say tonight. We all wish that we might send out our students possessing the liberal spirit which Mr. Hughes characterizes thus:

"the liberal spirit, humble in the presence of God, gladly restraining selfish ambition, to help others to a greater happiness, succoring the distressed, visiting the widows and orphans in their afflictions, indefatigable in endeavoring to correct injustice and strife, loyal to truth as the only voice of God man knows—that is the spirit which marks the true patriot in peace and forms the character which alone gives assurance of the perpetuity of the republic."

PRESIDENT HOPKINS, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

I wonder if we are not, in this discussion which we are having tonight in regard to college objectives and ideals, all of us trying to say the same thing and talking with a common denominator, all of us understanding

that we are seeking likewise the objectives and ideals of the society of the time, of which the college is one great agent. The one largest danger, it seems to me, in college administration work, college teaching and college communities, is that we shall become over-professionalized and shall look at the thing as something to be done for itself alone, forgetting that for which it needs to be done, to enhance the civilization of its time.

Life tends to become more inclusive all the time. The great lesson of the present, as it seems to me, if it is anything at all, is that life cannot henceforth be even as exclusive as it has been in the past; that the activities of life cannot be separated into water-tight compartments. We cannot think of ourselves primarily as ministering simply to one phase of life to the disregard of all else. And in this we are following, in some small degree, the analogy of developments in the industrial world. It is easily within the memory of men of our own time when, under so-called devices of efficiency and management, things were so departmentalized that I have heard men in great corporations, heads of departments, saying frankly that they had no concern as to whether what they were doing was for the good of the corporation or not; they were simply looking for the showing of their own departments and for the efficiency of their own departments.

Whatever has been true in the past, this spirit cannot be tolerated now. In the past it could be true as it cannot at the present time, that men should specialize in that way. When the country was a group of little communities, as in New England communities between the watersheds, one valley, separated from another, was almost as far as one end of the country is separated from the other at the present time, and it was possible to think in small terms and in dimensions of the smaller unit, but at the present time how impossible that is!

I have stood in the wireless receiving station of the great Arlington wireless and it has seemed to me if

there was an electric whisper anywhere in the world it could be heard there. We can travel from one end of the earth to the other at the present time in a less time than we could travel formerly from one of the thirteen original colonies to a more remote one at the other end of the country. We can talk from one portion of the world to another in an instant's time. Distances, after all, are nothing more than the time that it takes to get from one place to another, or the time it takes to go from one place to another.

Consequently mankind everywhere at the present time is under the necessity, in the content of knowledge, of receiving that impact from the thoughts and the acts of the whole world among all the varieties of people and the varieties of things that are in existence now. We have both the quantitative and the qualitative aspect of the problems thrust upon us in the field of higher education. We cannot say for the formal college that it is the only agency for deriving a higher education. There are men of genius and force, who will, even now, force their way through, and by sheer grit, perseverance and persistence educate themselves and will acquire from those about them those factors which we call education which make for the welfare of the world; and if the college is to be justified, the college must demonstrate notably that it is a quicker and an easier and a more thorough agency for giving education than can be got in any other way. Thus we find ourselves bound to meet the proposition and under the necessity of discussing the fact that while the college exists there are technical processes and technique and methods which are indispensable, and yet we cannot afford at any time to allow our interests to become so concentrated and so involved in these that we forget at any time what is the purpose for which they exist.

Mayor Mitchel of New York told me a few years ago of an experience he had with a Japanese Commission visiting this country. He said he was going with them

from the Bronx to the Battery and he took them in taxicabs to the elevated station; he then hurried them from the elevated railroad a few blocks, took them into the subway where they got a local train, rode a few blocks, got off, changed to an express train and were finally delivered to the Battery. When they got out the Chairman of the Commission bowed politely and inquired what was the object of all of those changes. Mayor Mitchel replied that by those various changes they had arrived at the Battery fourteen minutes earlier than they could have done otherwise, and then the Chairman of the Commission, again bowing politely, said, "What are we going to do with the fourteen minutes?" (Laughter.)

I think sometimes in hurrying from one place to another feverishly, trying to modify or develop this or that in the college, we find ourselves in the position of being asked, "What is to be done with that which we call the college education?" And we have to fall back upon the general proposition that the college exists for the unceasing correction of that working hypothesis which we know as the code of society, and we have to recognize that that working hypothesis, more correct than it has been in the ages past, is unquestionably less correct than it ought to be in the age to come. It seems to me that this is obvious. We recognize certain facts. We realize that we no longer are justified in doubting the truth of the Bible because we think the geology of the Book of Genesis is not right, since as a matter of fact the geology of fifty years ago, the most scientific geology of that time, is almost as much out of date now as that of the Book of Genesis. Nevertheless in natural science and in social science and in all that goes to make up the book of learning we are correcting the working hypothesis and constantly working nearer to that goal which can never be completely reached, the goal of abstract truth. We have to insist, it seems to me, therefore, that the college shall work with a better understanding of nature without our-

selves, and with a better understanding of nature within ourselves.

A beloved Yale professor used to give a lecture each year on the subject, "Geography When the World was Flat," and the object was to show to his class at the beginning of the course that the error of the theory that the world was flat was significant of almost universal error, making life full of prohibitions. He told, for instance, how in the ancient world, men were afraid to go to springs because, in some springs, there had been poisonous gases, and some persons had been asphyxiated, and this attribute had then been applied to all springs, and in like way men came to be afraid of the woods, mountains, lakes and the rivers, and thus all life was shut up in little compartments, the people afraid to go outside. Learning, if it means anything at all, means that all of those barriers must be lowered, that there must be no unexplored country, and likewise there must be no unexplored portion of mind or spirit within ourselves. Dean Inge, it is, I think, who says, that the difference of present civilization compared to ancient civilization is that the Greeks took pride in the fact that they were degenerate descendants of the gods, while we take pride in that we are more or less successful ascendants from the monkey, and that it is a matter of preference largely whether you want to be considered as going or coming. And we are constantly analyzing what the theory of progress is and how it is conserved, and we find that we have been under the somewhat benumbing influence of the theory that progress was inevitable, and that, as surely as one generation succeeded another, just so surely we were going to be farther advanced in the forth-coming generation. Yet there probably is some justification for the query as to whether we are not at the present time just as likely to be found on the threshold of a new Dark Ages as we are to be on the threshold of some greatly desired millennium.

There never was a period in history when harshness and acrimoniousness and discord were more rampant in

the world than at the present time. There never has been a time, it seems to me, when there was a more widespread belief that final truth had been acquired than there is at the present time. I suspect that the experience in a New England college office is not unusual in finding that there are large portions of the public constituency which believe that all economic truth has been derived from some source in the past, and that it is useless to speculate as to whether or not there is any advance to be made. Further, there are some of us who happen to have courses which are labeled "Evolution" at the present time, which Mr. Bryan and his associated evangelists are attacking, and we receive communications to the effect that these courses can no longer be taught because final truth in regard to this has been derived in some previous time, and that speculative thinking on this subject must not go on. And in the field of all of the social sciences we get like effect. Yet in our capacity as trustees for the present, we are on the other hand faced, wherever we turn, with the proposition that progress, if it is to be served and if it is to be made effective and carried on and delivered to the next generation, must be safeguarded as one of the most precious heritages of education as it is of all other activities in the world.

I suppose from the earliest time that is known all progress can be pretty definitely proved to have been the result of effort. We are told, and I believe with authenticity, that the way man happened to talk was, that finding the roof of his mouth greatly enlarged so that he could move his tongue around in it, he gradually began to emit various noises which, with various inflexions, enabled him to convey thoughts to others; and we are told that man, in the effort to utilize his front paws found so much work for his hands that he began to use them more profitably as hands! Now, we come to the time when the world is so small that we have to reckon necessary knowledge in terms of magnitude not conceived a few years ago, even. I heard a speaker at the begin-

ning of the War say the world had changed more in the last one hundred and fifty years than it had in all previous time. I think that probably is true, but I think it is about as true that the world has changed more in the past five years than in the previous one hundred and fifty years. We have all these agencies of philosophy, of the sciences and all the processes of knowledge before us, and we have this great content of information, so large a part of which must be at least understood and appreciated, if not actually known by each man. Moreover we have the thoroughly important necessity upon us of recognizing that we must acquire, in one way or another, the content of even an enlarged group for the progress of the world if we are going to carry through this idea of progress. And just as in the ancient autocracy, individual power was obliged eventually to give place to the rights of an enlarged minority, and that greatly enlarged group later enlarged the majority, so the serious question at the present time is, with all the agencies which are placed in the hands of the minority, have we not reached the time when the majority must expand its effort to include the minority within the realm of the majority and in agreement with it, in very large part, unless we are going to find obstructions placed in the way of the world and advancement made impossible.

Hence it seems to me the objectives and ideals of the college can be nothing else than the objectives and ideals of a society which wishes to progress and to improve itself and to transmit itself as a factor of advantage to the world at large. But there is another point, too! Just as we are under the necessity of comprehending and including within our sphere of knowledge those things which are external in the world of nature, so we are under the necessity of leveling those barriers of nature within our soul, within ourselves, which go under the name of convention and precedent—all of those things, which act as restrictions upon advancement and development, must be leveled and we must project ourselves out. But that

is easier said than done. About twenty years ago, once when traveling with President Tucker of Dartmouth, I was greatly surprised when he said he thought he would go aside and think for a little time, and when he took a seat on the other side of the car to sit in meditation. I wondered what a man did when he thought. It seemed to me an extraordinary thing for a man to go apart and to think by himself.

Yet it is only by thinking that we can recapitulate and appraise all these things which we have accepted from the past and it is only by such method that we can disabuse ourselves from error and that we can project our influence outside of the years which have been set for us sufficiently to create those new factors in the world and those new attitudes towards life by which the mind can progress. Thinking is not an easy thing, and if there is anything a college can do to enhance the art it ought to become one of the principal objectives of the college.

There is another thing in connection with the objectives of the college, and I think perhaps this is going to need more attention than any other single thing, that is that the opportunity for self-expression and the desire for self-expression and the potentiality for satisfaction shall be bred or created. I think the college must hold as an ideal the setting up within the mind of man of the desire for those things which will give full satisfaction to the man, and will give opportunity to enjoy some of these things from the sweetness of life as well as from activity and accomplishment.

I think that an allegorical story which is doubtless familiar to you, but is applicable in this case, will not be out of place here. There was a young weaver of tapestries who dwelt among a community of swine-herds. In that community men criticized and made aspersions about him, but he went on his way in want, meagerly provided for, weaving his beautiful patterns in the tapestry on the loom. But one day a man came to him and said, "You ought not to forgo as much as you do; you ought at

least to be well fed and, if you will carry swill to my pigs an hour a day, I will help you to keep the pot boiling and will give you meat." The next day another man, seeing his neighbor's success in securing cheap labor, said to the tapestry weaver, "This is a beautiful thing that you are doing and every man ought to do what he wants to do, but, if you will carry swill to my pigs an hour each day, I will provide you with vegetables."

And so long years passed away until at length the Recorder of Time came along and entered the house and saw in an adjoining room a dusty loom and an ancient piece of tapestry unfinished. He also saw an old man in a chair and the boiling pot upon the stove. Standing at the shoulder of the man who in his youth had been the tapestry weaver, but who had sold his opportunity for material things, the Recorder of Time said to him, "And what shall I put down in regard to you?" In answer the old man turned to him and said, "Put down, 'He kept the pot aboiling'"; but, instead, the great Recorder wrote, "He carried swill to pigs."

As I move about among college men and come to know something of their unfulfilled desires and as men tell me of the things that they formerly wished to do and what they still wish they might accomplish but have no opportunity for doing, I sometimes wonder if the colleges are sufficiently emphasizing the need of preserving the time and the disposition for the work on the tapestry as well as for keeping the pot aboiling. Furthermore, I query whether, if in each individual life the influence of finer things was preserved, there would not be in society at large much more to ameliorate the harshness of things about us.

And finally, I would emphasize again that the college function is not a separate function in any large degree, but is simply a different avenue of approach to the responsibilities of the world at large designed to make the individual man capable of serving society and designed

likewise to make the society of any particular time competent to be trustees of the civilization of that period.

It seems to me not enough to blame the attitude of society nor to plead freedom of obligation on the part of the college because of the indifference of the college student. There is something more to it than all this and that is that there shall be among college instructors and college officials a sense of conviction, a fervor for broadening and deepening intelligence, and an evangelism in preaching this which shall carry conviction to men and women, and to boys and girls, as it has never yet been carried.

When we reflect that less than one per cent of youth of the country ever acquire the opportunity of securing a college credential, it becomes necessary, it seems to me, for us, on the one hand, to take our function with a new seriousness and, on the other hand, to avoid thinking of it in a professional spirit, or in fact with any attitude at all except as a servant of the society of the time designated to enable that society to transmit to the future an enlarged and bettered influence over anything which it has received.

Just as there never was a greater crisis in history and just as there never was a greater obligation on men anywhere, so there was never a greater opportunity than at the present time for the colleges to make their men know that the world progresses by effort and that, in progressing by effort, it makes itself competent and increasingly strong for new effort through which there shall be given to man the capacity for new breadth and new liberality and a still more accurate correction of the great working hypothesis which we call life.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE AMERICAN WORKER

SPENCER MILLER, JR., M.A.

I.

Nineteen years ago a conference was held at Oxford University of all the colleges and universities in England to consider the question of adult working-class education. It proved to be an historic conference. For it was the first time in the history of English universities that they had ever met together on the same campus, and it was the first time that English universities as such had considered the relationship of the University to the Labor Movement in England.

Here, in the summer of 1903, representatives of Trade Unionists' Co-operative Societies and of Ruskin College, met representatives of English universities and other educational institutions at Oxford to discuss the educational aspirations of the labor movement. Some regarded the conference as a "mere attempt to reorganize University Extension," and indeed working-class newspapers at the time urged a reduction of university fees as a first step. But those who had brought about this conference, and desired to fashion a real "link between labor and learning," felt that no mere reorganization of University Extension would suffice if this challenge of the working-class of England was to be adequately met. A new spirit and a new method were needed. Furthermore, it became evident that any association of labor and learning which might be developed would have to be non-sectarian, and non-political; that the cost would have to be so low that no one would be excluded, and yet all who took part would bear some share of the expense, and, finally, that such an association would have to be democratically governed by its members.

The Conference gave formal recognition to an "Association to Promote Higher Education of Working Men"

which had been formerly launched by Albert Mansbridge, then in the service of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, and a few fellow co-operators and trade unionists at Toynbee Hall, London, in July, 1903. This Conference also brought to focus the movement for Adult Education which had been carried on for a hundred years in England and had received a new impetus four years before (1899) when Ruskin College, a resident labor college was founded (by three Americans) in the town of Oxford, England, to train leaders for the labor movement among the workers themselves.

From these simple beginnings at the Oxford Conference in 1903 the movement spread steadily if not rapidly through Yorkshire, the Midlands, and about the industrial centers of England. And the money for the work during these opening years came from the annual grants of working-class societies. The desire of the students in these centers for more continuous courses of study over a longer period of time than were conceived in the one-year classes of the Association was promptly expressed.

Accordingly in 1907 there was convened a second Conference at Oxford to consider the foundation of a Joint Committee of fourteen members, seven selected by the University and seven by the Workers' Educational Association, which became the new name of the Association started by Albert Mansbridge. This Conference looked forward to a more fundamental change in the plan of administration between the University and labor.

Two voices were raised at this second conference which had a great effect in persuading the Universities to their function. Bishop Gore, then Bishop of Birmingham, presided, and he called the attention of all the delegates to the fact, that by tradition it was the function of the Universities to educate the governing classes of England. With the phenomenal growth and power of the Labor Movement in England, however, he pointed out that the term "governing classes" was a more inclusive term than formerly:

"Everybody who has eyes to see," said Bishop Gore, "must recognize that the governing classes in England and in other countries include, and that continually in a broader and intenser form, those who work with their hands."

"What I should like to see brought about," he continued, "is that whenever in any city there is a guaranteed class of thirty persons, or of some such number, who undertake to see to the local expenses, there I want that the Universities—not Oxford and Cambridge only, but Oxford and Cambridge amongst other Universities—should be willing to provide a teacher who should help these men through this systematic course of study."

Added to the persuasive eloquence of the distinguished Bishop of Birmingham, was the challenge which was flung out to Oxford by J. M. MacTavish, a Scotch shipwright from the Portsmouth Dock Yard:

"I am not here as a suppliant for my class. I decline to sit at the rich man's gate praying for crumbs. I claim for my class all the best of all that Oxford has to give. I claim it as a right—wrongfully withheld—wrong not only to us but to Oxford. What is the true function of a University? Is it to train the nation's best men, or to sell its gifts to the rich? Instead of recruiting her students from the widest possible area, she has restricted her area of selection to the fortunate few. They come to her not for intellectual training, but for veneering. Not only are workpeople deprived of the right of access to that which belongs to no class or caste, the accumulated knowledge and experience of the race, but Oxford herself misses her true mission, while the nation and the race lose the services of its best men. I emphasize that point because I wish it to be remembered that workpeople could do far more for Oxford than Oxford can do for workpeople. For, remember, democracy will realize itself, with or without the assistance of Oxford, but if Oxford continues to stand apart

from the workpeople, then she will ultimately be remembered not for what she is but for what she has been."

It is recorded that this was the first time that a working class demand expressed by a worker was heard in the halls of Oxford. But the effect of the speech, of which this is but a brief part, was to bring complete support to the resolution for a Joint Committee of Administration.

In this manner was created fifteen years ago, the Joint Committee, the second great step in the development of Adult Workers' education in England. The concept of the Joint Committee—a real partnership of labor and learning—stands as one of the significant democratic reforms in education during the twentieth century.

Joint Committees became a significant advance in the development of a vital relationship between the University and the Labor Movement, and in a wider sense, the community. Its effect upon the Universities has been no less marked than upon the labor movement. To the University it brought a living contact with the problem of modern industrial society; to labor it brought an understanding of the world and an opportunity to share in the fashioning of an instrument so vital to British Democracy itself. And this plan developed at Oxford in 1908 has been extended to every college and university in England, Scotland, and Wales..

The University Tutorial Class Movement was developed by the action of these Joint Committees and became a significant addition to the one-year classes conducted by the Workers' Educational Association all over Great Britain. Within the past few years the W. E. A. has extended its branches into Australia and Canada with most satisfactory results. Together, these three year tutorial classes, and the far more numerous one year classes, which include upwards of 30,000 adult working-men and women, form the nucleus of a great invisible university of the people. During the academic year tutors go out to these classes in the villages and cities of Eng-

land, and in the summer, these classes meet upon the University campuses in regular summer schools to bind together the various local classes into a conscious whole.

The result of this educational movement has been to instill in people all over England the hope that the democracy of the future will be an educated democracy. In this connection it may be of interest to quote an estimate of the value of the Workers' Educational Association to the educational destiny of the British Commonwealth which has been set forth by Dr. Spurgeon in the current issue of the "Atlantic Monthly":

"The Workers' Educational Association which is the most significantly vital and hopeful Educational Movement in Great Britain, in more general terms upholds the importance of the abstract and humanistic studies, in its declaration that since the character of British Democracy ultimately depends on the collective wisdom of its adult members, no system of Education can be complete that does not promote serious thought and discussion on the fundamental interests and problems of life and society."

II.

The brief summary of the relation of the English worker to cultural life and the way in which the educational aspirations of labor have been met by the English Universities will serve as a background against which to present the subject of my address, "The University and the American Worker."

The reason for presenting this background is obvious. The English Universities are much older than ours and the roots of English culture are planted deep in the soil of the past; and, secondly, the English worker, with his homogeneous character and his continuous industrial background of a century and more, is more articulate in his desires and his needs. We can learn much from their experience, even though we recognize our social, political and educational differences with Great Britain.

There are, it seems to me, three considerations of prime importance in the examination of our own problem of the cultural life of the American worker. First, who is the American Industrial Worker, and what is the American Labor Movement? Second, what are the cultural aspirations of the American worker, and how are they being served? And, third, what is the responsibility of the American Colleges and Universities to serve this cultural aspiration of the American worker?

III.

According to the census returns, approximately forty-one million persons, ten years old and over, in this country are employed in gainful occupations. Of this number nearly thirteen million alone were, by the 1920 returns, in manufacturing and mechanical industries—an increase of somewhat less than two and one-half million in the past ten years. Added to this number are the transportation workers and the miners which number about four million workers in all. It is this group of seventeen million American industrial workers that I am considering at this time.

This industrial army is a heterogeneous grouping made up of native born and foreign born men and women, boys and girls, of the white, yellow and black races. These are the army of artisans who mine our coal, who turn the raw materials into finished products in our factories and workshops, who build our cities, and who run our transportation systems. And this industrial army does not include the farmer and other wage earning groups. I am not unmindful of the work nor of the aspiration of these groups, but I want you to consider the American industrial worker.

Our industrial worker is a product of our modern industrial society. And our modern industrial society is a direct result of the increasing application of power machinery to industry since the industrial revolution. A

decade ago the French philosopher, Henri Bergson, writing about the Industrial Revolution said:

"A century has elapsed since the invention of the steam engine and we are only just beginning to feel the depths of the shock it gave us. But the revolution it has effected in industry has, nevertheless, upset human relations altogether."

The truth of Bergson's prophecy is only now becoming apparent to us, as we see the way in which the revolution in industrial methods which is considerably less than a century old in this country has revolutionized our social relationships. The factory has literally transformed the character of American life and is having a profound effect upon the social, moral, and political life of the nation. Witness alone the growth of our urban communities.

As late as ten years ago, there were in the vast areas of this country seven million, five hundred thousand more persons in rural than in urban communities. In 1920 there were approximately three million more persons in urban than in rural districts of this country, which means that the drift from the country to the city in a decade has been so decided that our urban communities have grown over twelve millions in this period, whereas our rural communities have grown less than two millions. Everywhere the machine—the great non-human factor in industry—is bringing profound sociological changes. Into these factories are moving the boys from the farms, women from the homes, not a few of our unassimilated immigrants from foreign shores, and, as happened during the war, great numbers of negroes from the South. It is the very character of our modern industrial society which makes labor a commodity to be bought rather than a craftsman's skill to be rewarded.

So, in a more intense way, does the automatic machine—the "Iron Man of Industry"—change the very internal character of the factory system and make unnecessary trade skill for particular work. This "Iron Man" is a

veritable magnet for our juvenile population. And it accelerates the migration from the country to the city. As Arthur Pound has pointed out in the "Atlantic Monthly," "the State of Michigan shows the greatest percentage of urban growth from 1910 to 1920; also the greatest growth in the use of automatic tools."

The social consequence of the automatic machine in industry is to remove from work any opportunity for the expression of the creative instinct; any expression of personality in industrial effort. Work becomes a thing abhorred; something to escape from. The monotony and unimaginative routine makes a restlessness which becomes a distinct factor in the element of industrial unrest of our times. The occupation of the workers' leisure becomes an increasingly important problem. And the education of the worker becomes education for leisure. At the same time the educational character of production must be preserved and developed. As Mr. Gompers said recently in an address before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers:

"The old feeling of craftsmanship, which existed before the industrial revolution came about, has been greatly modified because of the perfection reached in machine design. This process, however, has been carried entirely too far, for in some places the man has become a human connecting link in a machine and mastered by it instead of controlling the machine itself, as he did with the tools that he used in the old days. The result is that to-day man's work tends to become mere toil, so it seems to me that the task that lies before us is to develop a definite kind of working environment which will be attractive and will inspire rather than repulse the workman. The work itself must become of more central concern. This cannot be brought about unless the man finds opportunity for self-expression in the day's work and a chance to exercise his creative impulse."

An even more impressive evidence of the effect of the industrial process is the growth of collective effort by workers. One need only view the vast increase in the size and power of the Labor Movements the world over to appreciate the primal loyalty which the worker feels toward his union. The international labor office of the League of Nations has estimated that the increase in membership of the Labor Unions in the past ten years has been from 10,835,000 to 32,680,000 (1920); this figure includes only the twenty chief countries.

Within the six year period from 1914-1920 organized labor in the United States alone has, according to one leading authority increased its membership from two million to six million workers, a gain of 200%. When we reflect that the census returns indicate that the increase from 1910 to 1920 of those engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries has been somewhat less than two and one-half millions, or about 20%, this tenfold increase in the size of our labor movement in six years cannot fail to impress us. To the industrial workers of America, the labor movement stands for their opportunity in the world, and their hope of a better world.

Furthermore, the Labor Movement is a natural organic part of modern industrial society. If its presence in the community is regarded as a problem, that problem cannot be solved by ignoring it. Nor can we expect in this country to eliminate unrest by crushing trade unionism, as is sometimes urged, nor by giving support to such campaigns as the "open shop" which in a period of industrial depression so unsuccessfully conceals its anti-union character.

Labor has become a significant force in the commonwealth not only as related to matters in the industrial and economic field, but in politics and in social relationship.

Any reader of the industrial history of the United States will readily understand the forces that gave rise to Trade unionism. On many occasions in the past the

labor movement has been the most emphatic protest against conditions which were reducing the stamina and demoralizing the manhood and womanhood of our industrial nations. The consistent support by labor for free public education; for social legislation looking toward a better standard of life for the men, women and children of this country is a part of its history.

But I am not here to praise Labor for its achievements; they belong to our common heritage. I do, however, want to remind this Conference that the Labor Movement represents an important constituent part of the Commonwealth and that its presence is a challenge to our Universities to serve as the need arises and the opportunities present themselves. The time has come when in the felicitous phrase of Matthew Arnold, the universities should—

“recognize a period of transformation and seek to adapt themselves honestly and naturally to the laws.”

IV.

It is sometimes asserted that the American Labor Movement is a wages and hours movement, concerned only with higher wages and shorter hours. Such an assertion reveals a lack of knowledge of our own American history and the history of the American Labor Movement. The aspirations of the American worker, even though his desires are not clearly expressed, are at base spiritual and not material. Indeed, it should be obvious that the spiritual roots of any great movement of the peoples must be planted deeper than the mere satisfaction of material needs. Labor seeks a fullness of life in work and an opportunity to inherit a share of the Kingdom of the World. This cultural aspiration is a deep lying desire among industrial workers. Lord Haldane, one of the most distinguished and brilliant English Statesmen of our

time, in a recent article on "Education for the Adult Workers," has written as follows:

"A social problem which is to-day confronting most of the civilized nations is unrest among industrial workers. There appears to be increasing dissatisfaction on the part of Labor with the position in which it finds itself. There is an obvious resentment at the extent of the gap which severs the employee from the employer.

"Scrutiny seems to disclose that this sense of unrest is due to something deeper lying than mere difference in the distribution of profit.

"If he has enough to give him a decent home and adequate leisure, he prefers the higher things of the mind to the lower heights of material prosperity."

Such a developing interest of the Labor Movement in culture and in wider educational opportunities is not ephemeral nor contemporary. In this country American Labor has maintained a long and continuous interest in education. During the early thirties of the last century the sustained demand of the labor movement for free public schools was one of the very important elements in the establishment of our public school system. The desire for adult education in our own time and century is but a new indication of the same interest in the educational process and in liberal culture. Some educators who know something of the English system are inclined to agree with Mr. Gompers when he writes in the "American Federationist" that—

"It may very well be that organized labor which took such a positive part in the establishment of popular education in the United States, will now take the lead in another movement of vital significance to the cultural development of this country."

The interest of American Labor in Adult Education began about a generation ago, but only during the past

decade has it become an integral part of the movement of any of the Unions. Within the past six years, the growth in this country has been very conspicuous. From the simple beginnings less than six years ago, the movement has grown in importance and influence, and to-day has not less than fifty Trade Union Colleges and study classes in different sections of the country in operation with a total of well over fifteen thousand students. No experiment in Adult Education among industrial workers has found more general support so rapidly, and it is not too much to expect that in a few years there will be similar Trade Union Colleges and study classes in every important industrial center in the United States.

It is an essential part of the English plan for workers' education, that the responsibility for the initiation and continuance of the class should rest definitely upon the local group. In this country the Trade Union becomes the responsible group in the locality. Its members select the subject of study, decide upon the time and place of meeting, and the general method of instruction. The class or college is distinctly self-governing. But the fact that the work has been begun by the Trade Union does not necessarily exclude other groups from participation; the Trade Union is simply the nucleus for educational endeavor.

Heretofore, our American colleges and universities, with few exceptions, do not seem to have been conscious of this field for service, nor have they given expression to the principle of the democratic participation of the students in the starting and direction of the class. As Professor Bittner has suggested in his excellent report on University Extension:

"The readiness of the (English) University authorities and of the (English) labor leaders to work with each other, the give-and-take character of their relationship and the rapidly growing interest on the part of the industrial classes

in cultural education, are facts which no American educator can afford to ignore. In spite of the social, political and educational differences between England and America, these facts have immense significance in our movement for extending higher education to the masses. To the Extension Worker they give a glimpse of new realities—realities that make the American Movement seem relatively undemocratic and condescending. Here the university gives all; there the classes are actually controlled by the students, though they are taught according to the university standards and by university men."

Among the two conspicuous exceptions to this generalization are Amherst College and Bryn Mawr, which have created Joint Administrative Committees for the promotion of Adult Education of Industrial Workers. At Amherst College, instructors have gone out to classes organized under the auspices of labor bodies in Springfield and Holyoke; at Bryn Mawr, the college campus with its equipment has been made available for women workers in industry. In both cases there has come a feeling of partnership between the College and Labor which is all too infrequent in this country at the present time. In several Western States also there has been considerable activity in the field of Adult Education for industrial workers, but even in States like Wisconsin, Michigan and California, this movement has not become commensurate with the effort made by a number of the English Universities in this work.

In the courses of study which have been selected in these Trade Union colleges and study classes, one may find distinct evidence of this searching for a culture which will interpret life and bring a fuller understanding of the world. Their courses are not in any sense trade preparatory or vocational, but are cultural and non-vocational. One will find such subjects as History, Sociology, Economics, Municipal Government, Labor and

Industry, Literature, Science and Public Speaking among the leading subjects. These courses are typical of the courses offered throughout the country.

It may be urged that the total number of industrial workers now engaged in Workers' Education represents a small percentage of the total membership in the Labor Movement. In a measure, this is true. But it does not represent the only reaching out for culture of the worker. The vast increase in the amount of reading, and the greater attendance in our public libraries are all evidence of this desire.

The demand on the part of the American industrial worker for the liberal culture of the colleges has, to be sure, not been great in volume nor widespread in its extent. It is also a fact that the universities of the country have not been greatly concerned in interpreting their culture to the average industrial worker. This generalization includes the development of the well-defined American movement of University Extension which recognizes that the true service of the University extends far beyond its walls and campuses to those who seek its help. The growth of the Extension Movement in this country during the past decade has certainly been phenomenal; the new impetus of the war carried it into new fields hitherto unexplored. Yet University Extension has not served this desire of the industrial worker for culture.

Americanization work which became part of the service of many of our colleges consisted for the most part in the teaching English to foreigners and imparting a few facts about our form of government to enable them to pass the naturalization examination. So, too, the factory classes provided another means of elementary English instruction to foreign-born workers with incidental information about safety first signs and a few health facts. In both cases, the elementary nature of the work has little in common with the cultural aspects of

Workers' Education. Even where such elementary instruction has been undertaken in cooperation with the University, the work has been by its own nature ephemeral and limited in value.

Wherefore, Adult Working Class Education in this country has grown up during the past five years outside the universities and outside the University Extension Movement. This growth has been due to the fact that the Universities have not been prepared to serve this movement, nor have they been conscious of the "new reality" of democratic management to which Dr. Bittner refers. In the very element of self-development of the American Workers' Educational Movement there is much hope. The vitality of such work is not determined by the ability of the university to provide courses, but by the ability of the local groups to give voice and form to their aspirations.

Workers' Education then, whether in Britain or America, is essentially non-vocational, cultural instruction of a class organized and managed by the voluntary effort of its members, sustained by their collective interest and supported, in part at least, by their funds. The method of instruction is discussion wherein the usual relation of teacher and student tends to disappear and a more informal fellowship of instruction prevails. Essentially a friendly exchange of experiences and ideas is the spirit of each discussion—namely, a comradeship in a common quest for truth. "How shall a man learn," wrote Xenophon, "save from one who is his friend?"

V.

What service, then, can our colleges and universities render the industrial workers of this country? Indeed, what responsibilities rest at the doors of these centers of culture in our modern industrial society? If our universities which symbolize our culture are not serving this cultural aspiration of the American industrial worker, are

they discharging their full responsibility? Are they promoting industrial peace?

I suppose our colleges and universities in their detachment from the industrial world would be the last to admit that they were responsible in any way for industrial unrest. Nevertheless, their very detachment from the industrial worker, their failure to provide, not vocational training, but non-vocational, cultural opportunities, is certainly not an unimportant element in the present strife. In fact, it may be entirely possible that in this matter of industrial unrest, which is deeper than any mere economic inequality, that we reject the cure, while deplored the malady.

To quote Lord Haldane's words again:

"All over the world those who work with their hands are calling for a higher knowledge. Without that knowledge they feel that they cannot be free. They are held back by fetters of ignorance from the freedom to solve their own social problems. Those who know these problems must profoundly know that they would disappear, were they in the hands of educated men. There is a class division in knowledge which goes deeper down than any class division I know, and it is the sense of class division which is producing much of the unrest in the industrial world which will solve these problems, and I think that is the feeling, which is beginning to take hold of the democracy itself just as strongly as it has taken hold of the intellectual class.

"If that be so, we have to recognize that democracy is a craving for spiritual freedom, and that is the meaning of Adult Education."

Certainly it is true that if these academic walls are only barriers behind which students and teachers confer, there will be little chance of the American worker to share in the culture of that college life. The isolation of our colleges from the community in many places accounts for the aloofness of the worker toward our

colleges. And the proof of this isolation today is the growth of this movement outside the walls of the seats of learning, if not in opposition to the universities, at least, without the active cooperation of many of them.

There is a tradition among certain of our colleges that the University is a repository of truth, that it is their function to test and add to knowledge; and yet it does seem to be evident that there is another function equally as important—the dissemination of knowledge. In this way they can aid understanding. One of the great difficulties of our times is that knowledge increases more rapidly than our understanding; we all find it difficult to digest the rapidly increasing volume of facts and discoveries—much less make use of them.

The Universities have the splendid examples of two American colleges—Amherst and Bryn Mawr—both of high standing as centers of liberal culture. These can at least suggest some of the underlying principles which are indispensable in such a service. If the college and universities of this country would begin honestly and sincerely to interpret themselves, their aims and purposes, and carry the message of their willingness to serve this work, and the workers themselves, in the different localities, unexpected links might be developed.

During a recent endowment fund campaign of Vassar College, half a dozen or more local unions subscribed to the fund from their local treasuries an amount of twenty-five dollars and more. The Workers' Education Bureau of America wrote to these Unions in commendation of their action and urged them to share more vitally in the culture of this college, as well as in its support. The following letter has just come, which may suggest the way in which cooperation may be established between the university and labor:

"Your letter of December 21st with enclosed article, received. I read this letter before a meeting of our Local Union 203, of Poughkeepsie, and after explaining same to them, a number of

ASSOCIATION OF

the younger men seemed very much interested in the possibility of forming a class.

"If Vassar College, through President McCracken, or through Mr. Philip Bradley, or any other instructor, would be interested in forming a class of this kind, I think arrangements could be made whereby this Carpenters' Union would allow the use of their hall for the meetings of the classes.

"Any information you could give me on the subject I should be pleased to receive.

"Yours,

(Signed) "CHAS. J. ZEIL,

"Carpenters and Joiners of America,
"Local Union No. 203."

The Workers' Education Bureau sent out a questionnaire to all the college presidents in this country on the subject of Adult Workers' Education. This query yielded about the customary average of returns; we found that up to the present time there has been no conspicuous move on the part of American Colleges to view the matter in this broader spirit. In certain instances this questionnaire revealed evidences of genuine cooperation. But these were few in number. Several colleges which have been created for industrial workers have labor men on the board of trustees, but this is decidedly an exception. In several instances we had the evidence of good will and a real interest to serve any such industrial group in any subject upon reasonable conditions. But these colleges and universities were far too few in the total of over six hundred. Not a few of the institutions expressed interest but pleaded an over-worked faculty and an under-supported college, yet again one wonders whether the wider service by these colleges might not widen the basis of their support?

Adult Education is, moreover, as vital to our political organization as to our educational need. Ours must essentially be an educated democracy if it is to continue.

The conclusion of the English Commission on Adult Education deserves to be re-quoted here:

"Adult Education must not be regarded as a luxury for a few exceptional persons here and there, nor as a thing as concerns only a short span of early manhood, but Adult Education is a permanent national necessity, an inseparable aspect of citizenship, and, therefore, should be both universal and life-long."

There is perhaps one fundamental principle which distinguishes English Adult Education from the similar movement in this country. A basic part of accepted English policy toward higher education is that it does not pay; fees are not increased to pay the cost, as they might bar the most needy, the cost is met in part by Government grants for cultural education. We shall have to come to this position in America; and once arrived there, we shall ask ourselves about this whole question of education and how we can add permanently to its support.

The question of Adult Education, particularly for industrial workers, is not a matter of temporary interest; it is a permanent element of our national educational effort. This movement is not an attempt to make up for the education lost while the worker was in industry. The movement gives expression to a fact which is rapidly growing in our own consciousness—that education is a continuous process; and that it is as much a part of the essential element of our democratic communities as free public education is an essential part of the preparation of our youth for the obligations of citizenship.

Can our colleges and universities fail to serve this movement? The American worker seeks knowledge and understanding—not degrees and diplomas. This, it seems to me, is a search for truth.

No state or municipal university deriving its support from the people of the state or municipality can justify

a position of indifference toward the adult worker. And we shall come more and more to the realization that no college or university can longer continue to be a private institution, save in the source of its income. For the obligation upon the colleges and universities to serve the people of the American Commonwealth makes them all public institutions.

As the Labor Movement in this country grows in power and influence, we shall be met by the same problem which Bishop Gore clearly phrased at Oxford in 1907; namely, is it not the function of the universities, in educating the governing classes, to provide increasingly for the education of workers, since they must take an ever larger part in the government? And so we in America must answer the question as to what is to be the relationship of our colleges and universities to the American Labor Movement? Are our colleges going to serve the cultural aspirations of the workers, or are they going to stand aloof?

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

DEAN COLE, OBERLIN COLLEGE

The Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was constituted a year ago, at the meeting of this Association in New York. It is a joint commission, on which Dr. Kelly and President Murlin represent the Council of Church Boards of Education, the other members of the Association of American Colleges. The choice of a chairman, which was made by the Commission itself, was completed early in March. Consideration of the subject matter of a report has been in progress since that time.

It has not proved feasible to secure a meeting of the Commission until this morning. The framing of the

report has been accomplished by correspondence, unquestionably a less satisfactory way of doing it than personal conference would have been. The deficiencies that will doubtless be found in the report are consequently to be charged to the personal responsibility of the chairman much more than they could have been if the circumstances had been different.

In making the report the Commission has had the option of discussing in detail the principles upon which the conclusions were to be founded, or of stating as succinctly as possible the conclusions and the grounds for them. It has seemed best, on the whole, to adopt the latter plan. A first report upon subjects so important and of such extensive bearings, and especially a report made in the time that this one has been, must necessarily be tentative in character. It has seemed wise, therefore, to present the briefer document, to ascertain the possibility of securing its adoption with or without modification, and to leave for the work of another year the preparation of a more elaborate discussion, if that is felt to be necessary.

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

It is undeniably true that, as President Lowell remarked in his annual report for 1916-17, the code of professional ethics for teachers has not been thoroughly developed, and is not fully understood either by teachers or trustees. The fact is to be regretted, for it necessarily affects unfavorably the morale of the teachers, the general estimation in which the profession is held, and the friendliness of relations between teachers, administrators, and trustees everywhere. The development of a code such as the other professions possess would serve the interests of teachers and colleges alike, for those interests are at bottom identical. It would undoubtedly prove a difficult and tedious process, but it would be found to be concerned for the most part only with the topics assigned for study in this report.

A very valuable suggestion toward this end, it would seem, is one made by Professor H. W. Tyler in the Educational Review for December, 1920. It is that an acceptable standard code of what academic freedom means and what it does not mean should be worked out by collaboration of the parties in interest, and that a standard procedure in cases of dispute over academic tenure should be agreed upon by the same parties. The significant and highly important work already done in the field by the Committee of the American Association of University Professors on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure would naturally be taken as the initial contribution to such an end. If similar studies might now be made by the various organizations of colleges and universities, considerable progress might be made, through comparison and harmonization of the results, toward the realization of a worthy code of professional ethics for teachers. The present report is offered as a tentative basis for the contribution of the American College Association toward that end.

Meantime, until the greater document is drawn, the primary object of a formulation by this Association is, as far as it may be attained by this means, twofold: first, to secure for competent, judicious teachers in the colleges of the Association the sense of security and the peace of mind which are indispensable to the efficiency of their work; second, to insure protection of the colleges against wanton, persistent injury from utterances of the incompetent and injudicious.

It should be clearly recognized, however, that the adoption of a report by this organization cannot have the effect of legislation for the colleges comprised in it. The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing body. The sum total of immediate result to be anticipated from the proposed adoption of a report is the influence that may be exercised by a plain statement of the beliefs of the Association as a whole upon these all-important topics.

Academic Freedom

The question of academic freedom is merely a special application of the problem of freedom of speech, the subject of controversy, in one phase or another, as old as the world. Wide as are the varieties of belief upon the main problem, they are certainly no wider than the divergence of views upon the question of the degree to which the college teacher has limited his liberty of utterance by his choice of a profession. The range of recent opinion upon this point may be illustrated by four quotations:

(a) A college president in 1920: "Academic freedom is an academic delusion and does not exist outside the brains of visionary idealists.

. . . Public educational institutions always must be conservative places, and discussions of new projects will be more hampered there than outside their walls." (Quoted by H. W. Tyler, l. c.)

(b) An editorial writer in the New York Times in 1916: "Academic freedom, that is, the inalienable right of every college instructor to make a fool of himself and his college by vealy, intemperate, sensational prattle about every subject under the sun, to his classes and to the public, and still keep on the pay-roll or be reft therefrom only by elaborate process, is cried to all the winds by the organized dons." (Quoted by Mecklin, School and Society, April, 1916.)

(c) President Lowell in the Report quoted above: "Experience has proved, and probably no one would now deny, that knowledge can advance, or at least can advance most rapidly, only by means of an unfettered search for truth on the part of those who devote their lives to seeking it in their respective fields, and by complete freedom in imparting to their pupils the truth that they have found."

(d) President Schurman to the National Association of State Universities, in 1909: "The supreme test is whether the people of the state

will on the one hand tax themselves to support it [the state university], and on the other impose upon themselves a self-denying ordinance to leave it severely alone, so that it may select its own members by the application of its own intellectual standards, and the members thus chosen may be absolutely free to investigate, to teach, and to publish what they believe to be the truth."

Somewhere between the extremes here expressed a working agreement must be found. Academic freedom is not a myth, neither is it license unrestrained and irresponsible. What it should be may be stated best in terms of liberty and responsibility. The ideal college atmosphere is one in which, on the one hand, the institution guarantees to all its teachers unrestricted freedom in teaching, investigation, and publication, and in which, on the other hand, competent, judicious scholars exercise their freedom with fitting regard for the welfare and reputation of the institution they serve. Such an atmosphere should be the ultimate aim of every institution of learning; in it every trace of the problem of academic freedom would disappear.

Impediments to immediate and general realization of ideal conditions inhere in the very nature of the parties to the relation. Colleges are hampered in their approach to it by two facts. One is that many, perhaps most, of them owe their origin and present support to constituencies whose convictions on certain controversial topics make it quite impossible for colleges maintained by them to allow complete freedom in the teaching of those topics, even in the privacy of the classroom. The other is the immaturity and consequent extreme impressionability of the student body. Topics and doctrines that are in themselves entirely suitable material for thought and study are in some cases wholly inappropriate for consideration in college, and in others call for the most careful and considerate handling. Exclu-

sion or restriction in such cases results from the necessary exercise of "pedagogic common sense."

The failures of teachers to achieve their side of the ideal of academic freedom are mainly the inevitable outcome of individual lack of perfection. Quite aside from the occasional lapses of judgment to which all are subject, there are two general conditions that bear on this side of the problem. One is that so large a proportion of the teaching staff of most colleges is in the lower ranks of the faculty, and in the nature of the case comes somewhat short of a full measure of competency, either in training or in experience. The other is that prolonged teaching of youth tends, as has not infrequently been pointed out, to beget in teachers a spirit of reckless authority, leading the occasional one who yields to it to utter dicta on all sorts of subjects without sufficient regard either for the facts involved or the effect upon other interests, including even those of his college. These facts, together with the immaturity of the material the teacher works upon, go far to invalidate the parallel often drawn between the position claimed for the college teacher and that of a federal judge, with his freedom from responsibility to the appointing power for his acts and utterances.

The trend of future experience must be in the direction of ever greater freedom, but outgrowing the hindrances to it must be a matter of much time and effort. Meantime, pending the advance and in anticipation of it, much may be gained from the adoption and general observance of certain definite conventions concerning freedom in the formation and expression of opinion by college teachers. As such temporary conventions the following may be suggested:

- (a) The college may not place any restraint upon the teacher's freedom in investigation, unless restriction upon the amount of time devoted to it becomes necessary in order to prevent undue interference with the teaching which is the primary function of the college instructor.

(b) The college may not impose any limitation upon the teacher's freedom in the exposition of his own subject in the classroom or in addresses and publications outside the college, except in so far as the general necessity of adapting all instruction to the needs of immature students, or specific stipulations in advance, fully understood and accepted by both parties, limit the scope and character of instruction. If specific stipulations are made, they should be regarded as necessary concessions to weaknesses in the existing situation, and be dispensed with as soon as circumstances will permit.

(c) No teacher may claim as his right the privilege of discussing in his classroom controversial topics outside of his own field of study. The privilege is often exercised, but the support of the college may not be expected in cases where friction arises from the practice.

(d) The college must recognize the teacher's right, in speaking or writing outside of the college upon subjects beyond the scope of his own field of study, to precisely the same freedom and the same responsibility as attach to all other persons, subject only to the necessity of protecting the good name and the welfare of the college against serious injury. The teacher in all speaking and writing of this character should be scrupulous in making it clear that his institution has no responsibility for the views expressed by him.

All such conventions are but makeshifts, however, and must be outgrown. Yet even while they hold sway, until the hoped-for advance to an atmosphere of universal trust, forbearance and good-will on both sides, every effort should be made by institutions and teachers to work in the spirit of the better time to come. Colleges should, while guarding as they must the fair fame and all vital interests of the institution, grant the largest possible measure of freedom of utterance, and teachers should, while holding with all fidelity to their highest

ideals in the pursuit and dissemination of truth, give due consideration also to the limitations inevitably imposed upon them by the nature and situation of the institution they serve. With such a spirit dominant in both parties, the few cases of controversy now arising over academic freedom will become fewer still.

Academic Tenure

Controversies over academic freedom almost invariably and inevitably develop into problems of tenure. Not more than a small part, however, probably less than one-third, of all conflicts over academic tenure grow out of abuses, real or supposed, of academic freedom. A formulation of principles, policies and methods of procedure in regard to academic tenure is consequently even more important than one in regard to academic freedom.

The objects aimed at in the formulation of principles here are substantially the same as in the one relating to academic freedom, namely, the peace of mind of the teacher and the protection of all vital interests of the college. Both are of the utmost importance, but it can hardly be over-emphasized that conditions of tenure are destined henceforth to have much to do with the possibility of recruiting vigorous, truth-loving and truth-seeking men and women for the teaching profession. Security of tenure must make amends in some degree for sacrifices at other points, if the colleges are not to be limited to inferior material for their teaching staffs.

The general principle of academic tenure should be that the security of a teacher's position, after a suitable period of probation has been passed, is to be considered as beyond question. Two exceptions only may be made to the rule. If a teacher should be found unworthy of his position for some grave cause, such as personal immorality, disloyalty to the country, professional incompetence, or gross neglect of duty, no rules of tenure should erect a barrier to his dismissal, provided the facts

be admitted by the accused teacher or be established under suitable procedure. And if the college should find itself, by reason of financial straits, under a genuine necessity of reducing the cost of its teaching staff, or, because of lack of demand at some point, obliged to cut down a departmental staff, customary restraints of tenure would necessarily yield to economic pressure.

Care in the choice and testing of teachers is of fundamental importance. It is not difficult, as a rule, to determine the professional competence of a candidate for the position that is to be filled, but it is practically impossible to make sure in advance that the candidate and the college will fit each other temperamentally. From this fact arises the need of a sufficient period of probation, during which both college and candidate may be tried out with reference to their mutual fitness for a permanent relation. When probation gives way to recognized permanency of greater or less degree, the trust reposed in the teacher should be complete, capable of being broken only by evidence that would stand examination anywhere.

Methods of appointment, probation, reappointment, termination of appointment, and dismissal, are therefore obviously of prime importance in connection with the subject of tenure. The following recommendations are offered in regard to them:

- (a) First appointments should as a rule be temporary and be followed by renewals or short-term appointments until the competence of the appointee and the mutual compatibility of the college and the appointee are fully established. Thereafter a greater security of tenure, especially in the higher ranks, should be indicated by characterization of the appointment as permanent, indefinite, without term, or for some extended term with presumption of renewal at its expiration. All appointments should be made in conference with the department concerned, and might well be subject to approval by a faculty

or council committee, or even by the faculty or council itself. The precise terms and expectations of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both college and teacher.

(b) Termination of a temporary or a short-term appointment should always be possible at the expiration of the term by the mere act of giving timely notice of the desire to terminate. The decision to terminate should always be taken, however, in conference with the department concerned, and might well be subject to approval by a faculty or council committee or by the faculty or council. Notice of the decision to terminate should be given in ample time to allow the teacher an opportunity to secure a new position. The extreme limit for such notice should not be less than three months before the expiration of the academic year. The teacher who proposes to withdraw either before or at the end of a term should give equal notice.

(c) Termination of a permanent, indefinite, or long-term appointment for cause should regularly require action by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the college. Exception to this rule may be necessary in cases of gross immorality or of disloyalty to the country, when the facts are admitted. In such cases summary dismissal would naturally ensue. In cases where other offenses are charged, and in all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should always have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. In the trial of charges of professional incompetence, the testimony of scholars in the same field, either from his own or from other institutions, should always be taken. Dismissal for other reasons than immorality, treason, or gross neglect of duty should not ordinarily take effect in less than a year from the time that the decision is reached.

(d) Termination of permanent or long-term appointments because of financial exigencies should be sought only as a last resort, after every effort has been made to meet the need in other

ways and to find other suitable employment in the institution for the teacher concerned. Situations which make drastic retrenchment of this sort necessary should ordinarily preclude expansions of the staff at other points at the same time.

These are the recommendations the Commission feels warranted in offering at the present time. Two further suggestions that have been before the Commission—that every institution should be asked to formulate definitely the grounds that would be regarded as justifying the dismissal of faculty members from that institution, and that this Association should have some agency to investigate dismissals upon request of the teacher concerned—do not seem to the Commission to involve matters upon which recommendations may be wisely offered at this time.

One further recommendation that may be offered is that this Association suggest to the American Council on Education either the appointment of a joint Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure from its constituent bodies, or an effort to secure the appointment of a Commission by each of those bodies to deal with this question, with a view to securing concerted action and a widely authoritative statement of principles at an early date.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SABBATIC LEAVE

DEAN OTIS E. RANDALL, BROWN UNIVERSITY

Before beginning our investigation, the Commission took pains to ascertain what steps, if any, had already been taken by other organizations toward the solution of our problems. We found that the division of educational relations of the National Research Council had made an excellent report in the fall of 1919 based on the returns from a questionnaire sent out to 580 colleges. We also found that the American Association of Uni-

versity Professors had a Committee on Sabbatical Systems already at work, but that on account of the illness of the chairman, Professor Jastrow, of the University of Wisconsin, the report had not been completed. Professor Jastrow made the happy suggestion that the two organizations unite forces, a plan which our Commission is glad to adopt.

Our Commission decided at once that we could gather the material on which to base our report through a questionnaire better than in any other way. We therefore immediately prepared a questionnaire and sent it to the colleges and to the undergraduate and graduate schools of arts and sciences in the Universities of the United States and Canada. The questions were arranged in two sections. Questions in the first set had to do with present practice in the various institutions and were asked in the hope of securing information as to whether any provision whatever is made for sabbatic leave; the conditions under which an officer of instruction is entitled to leave of absence; the different divisions of the teaching force to which the privilege is open; the proportion of the faculty availing themselves of the opportunity; the proportion of the regular salary which the professor receives during his absence either for a whole or a half year; the arrangements made for the performance of the work of the absent professor; the restrictions or directions made concerning the use which the absent professor shall make of his time; and the prominent benefits derived from the use of the privilege.

Questions in the second set had to do with desired practice and were asked in order that we might get all the suggestions we could concerning possible improvements in present conditions. We were particularly anxious to learn the attitude of the several institutions, concerning the following matters: The jurisdiction which the college should exercise over the absent professor; the various acceptable uses he might make of his time while absent; the proportional part of

his regular salary which he should receive during his absence whether for a full or a half year; and the obligation on the part of the college not only of making it possible for members of the faculty to enjoy the privilege of sabbatic leave, but also of insisting that they shall use the privilege not alone for themselves but for the college.

The questions were addressed to the Presidents of the Colleges and Universities, and were answered promptly and very frankly, and the Commission wish here to express their sincere gratitude to the Presidents and other college officers for their generous cooperation, and particularly for the many helpful suggestions which they offered in personal letters.

As the questionnaire was not sent out until November 21st, we can only make a partial report on our work at this meeting. In case the Association think the matter of sufficient importance, the Commission can prepare a more satisfactory report at a later date when the returns of our questionnaire are more nearly completed and we have had more time to study the returns.

Five hundred and ninety questionnaires were sent out, accompanied by the following note:

Dear Mr. President:

The Commission appointed by the Association of American Colleges to consider questions concerning sabbatic leave are anxious to secure information and suggestions from the various colleges in time to tabulate the results and to report to the Association at their meeting next January. *The inquiries are to be limited to the colleges and to the undergraduate and graduate schools of arts and sciences in the Universities.*

The value of the report will, of course, depend largely upon the accuracy and the extent of the information which we may be able to obtain from the many colleges of our country.

It is with great reluctance that we burden you with a questionnaire, but since the object of our effort is to secure information in which all the

colleges will be interested, we hope that we may count on your cooperation.

Will you, therefore, be kind enough to answer the following questions as soon as you can conveniently and forward the reply in the enclosed envelope to Dean Otis E. Randall, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

O. E. Randall, Brown University.

W. A. Neilson, Smith College.

W. D. Scott, Northwestern University.

C. A. Richmond, Union College.

J. S. Nollen, Grinnell College.

The Questionnaire

Name of Institution.....

Part I.

PRESENT PRACTICE

Note—Please insert a + on the to indicate your answer yes or no.

1. Does your institution make provision for sabbatic leave: (a) as an official policy? 58 yes; 226 no; 18 blank; 26 other replies. (b) as practice in special cases? 70 yes; 170 no; 61 blank; 27 other replies.

2. What is the minimum time of service which an officer must render in your institution before he is entitled to sabbatic leave? years. Not calculated.

3. Is the privilege of sabbatic leave extended to those under professorial rank (instructors and assistants)? 24 yes; 88 no; 205 blank; 11 other replies.

4. Are any conditions other than time of service and rank taken into consideration? 11 yes; 48 no. If so, what? 215 blank; 54 other replies.

5. Is the privilege open to administrative officers (Presidents, Deans, Registrars, Comptrollers, etc.)? 47 yes; 51 no; 215 blank; 15 other replies.

ASSOCIATION OF

6. What proportion of your Faculty avail themselves of this privilege yearly? Not calculated.

7. If this proportion is large or small, will you give the reasons for it? Not calculated.

8. Do administrative officers find it feasible to leave their posts for a half year or a year? 34 yes; 62 no; 211 blank; 21 other replies.

9. In case a member of the Faculty is absent on leave for a full academic year, what portion of his regular salary does he receive during his absence? 15 whole; 61 half; 31 none; 172 blank; 49 other replies.

10. In case a member of the Faculty is absent on leave for a half academic year, what portion of his regular salary for the half year does he receive during his absence? 35 whole; 19 half; 24 none; 200 blank; 50 other replies.

11. In case a member of the Faculty is absent on leave for a full academic year, what arrangements do you make for the performance of his work? (a) Is the work distributed among other members of the Faculty? 30 yes; 73 no; 187 blank; 38 other replies. (b) Is a substitute provided? 42 yes; 8 no; 179 blank; 29 other replies. (c) Is this done without financial loss to the institution? 65 yes; 46 no; 189 blank; 28 other replies. (d) Is the work dropped during the absence of the professor? 7 yes; 92 no; 202 blank; 33 other replies.

12. In case a member of the Faculty is absent on leave for a half academic year, what arrangements do you make for the performance of his work? (a) Is the work distributed among other members of the faculty? 28 yes; 41 no; 217 blank; 42 other replies. (b) Is a substitute provided? 56 yes; 14 no; 228 blank; 30 other replies. (c) Is this done without financial loss to the institution? 49 yes; 29 no; 232 blank; 18 other replies. (d) Is the work dropped during the absence of the professor? 1 yes; 64 no; 236 blank; 27 other replies.

13. What restrictions or directions are made concerning the use which the member of the Faculty shall make of his time? Not calculated.

14. Do members of your Faculty on leave of absence as a rule make good use of the opportunities for self-improvement open to them and come back better fitted for service to the college? 118 yes; 206 blank; 4 other replies.

Part II.

DESIRED PRACTICE

15. Would you regard it a proper use of opportunities if the absent member spent the time: (a) In travel and sight-seeing? 104 yes; 26 no; 171 blank; 27 other replies. (b) In writing or in investigation? 155 yes; 3 no; 158 blank; 12 other replies. (c) In work intended primarily for personal remuneration when he is already receiving remuneration from the institution? 15 yes; 143 no; 165 blank; 50 other replies. (d) In restoration of health? 156 yes; 5 no; 162 blank; 9 other replies. (e) In general recreation? 53 yes; 82 no; 167 blank; 26 other replies.

16. Should the time which the member of the Faculty takes in order to serve as an exchange professor be counted as a year on sabbatic leave? 43 yes; 83 no; 190 blank; 12 other replies.

17. In case a member of the Faculty has found it impossible to leave his post for a period of fourteen years, should he be entitled: (a) To a more extended leave of absence? 56 yes; 83 no; 175 blank; 14 other replies. (b) To a more generous remuneration than he would be entitled to after a seven years' period of service? 65 yes; 65 no; 182 blank; 16 other replies.

18. If a member of the Faculty on sabbatic leave for one year makes good use of his opportunities, are the benefits to the college of sufficient value to warrant the payment of: (a) Full salary? 56 yes; 45 no; 199 blank; 28 other replies. (b) Half salary? 75 yes; 9 no; 246 blank; 4 other replies. (c) Other fractional part? 1 yes; 2 no; 309 blank; 16 other replies.

19. If it is found to be impracticable to pay full salary during a year's leave of absence, is

the college justified in granting a half year on sabbatic leave in case the time is used profitably:
(a) With the full half year's salary? 96 yes; 24 no; 190 blank; 18 other replies. (b) With half the half year's salary? 42 yes; 8 no; 273 blank; 5 other replies. (c) With other fractional part of the half year's salary? 7 yes; 2 no; 310 blank; 9 other replies.

20. In case it is found impracticable to grant sabbatic leave for a full academic year and on full pay, is the college justified in granting a half year's leave of absence every fourth year and without reduction in pay? 72 yes; 44 no; 183 blank; 29 other replies.

21. In case a member of the Faculty receives remuneration from the college during sabbatic leave and is in good physical and mental condition, has the college the right to determine how he shall use his time? 96 yes; 20 no; 180 blank; 32 other replies.

22. Have you any suggestions or information to offer concerning any phase of the problem before us? Not calculated.

23. Can you give us information concerning literature that has been published and not already listed in general indexes or any investigation that has been carried on by anyone bearing on this matter? Not calculated.

(Signed)

President.

.....
(Name of Institution)

....., 1921.

From a superficial reading of the answers to the questionnaire and from the personal letters which have been received, the following statements may be safely made.

The question of sabbatic leave is of far greater importance to the college world than many of us had been inclined to think, a question which is regarded as having a vital relation to the welfare and the efficiency

of all our educational institutions and one which should rank with questions of salary, pension and other matters which have to do with the success and prosperity of those to whom we entrust the education of our youth. Many institutions regard the practice of granting to the officers of instruction leave of absence under generous conditions not as a privilege earned by faithful service on the part of the instructor, but as an obligation to the institutions themselves for the sake of their own efficiency and usefulness. The President of one of the New England Colleges said that he regarded the granting of sabbatic leave as about as good an investment as the college could make. Others suggested that the colleges would do well to set aside special funds for the purpose of financing a plan of sabbatic leave under generous conditions in the same way as funds are set aside for financing a pension system. One President had gone so far as to suggest the wisdom of bringing the matter to the attention of some of our public benefactors, a second Rockefeller or a second Carnegie, in the hope of securing a foundation upon which a generous plan of sabbatic leave might be worked out for all the colleges.

The majority of the colleges report that they are making no provisions whatever for leave of absence, but in many instances express regret that they have not found it possible to make such provision. One college President, however, reports that inasmuch as professors are hired for twelve months in the year and are given vacation of three months each year, the professors have no right to expect anything further in the way of vacation.

Under the provisions made in most of the colleges, many of the professors have found it impossible to take advantage of the privilege of sabbatic leave because of inability to meet expenses. Many professors have for this reason never seen the time when they could enjoy the advantages which the college authorities were apparently offering to them. It seems reasonable to say that institutions which grant the privilege of sabbatic

leave and do not at the same time sufficiently provide for the needs of the professor to make it possible for him to take advantage of this provision, are doing little better than the institutions which make no provision whatever. Furthermore, they open the door of opportunity to those who by chance or good fortune have independent means and who are not in any way dependent upon the generosity of the college, while they close the door to those who are dependent upon their own resources and who are likely to be greatly in need of the advantages to be gained by a year's leave of absence.

It is a common opinion that the college for the sake of her intellectual health, should adopt some policy by which it shall be possible for each member of the Faculty of professorial rank to leave his post every seventh year for at least eight months of the twelve, that he may devote himself to study and self-improvement. Some claim that, in case an instructor hesitates under such conditions to accept the privilege open to him, the college should for her own sake insist that he shall not let the opportunity pass.

There are those who feel that it is not desirable to encourage the practice of granting leave of absence for a full year oftener than once in seven years because of the danger of interrupting the continuity of the professor's work in college which has an important value. This argument, of course, would lose some of its force in case the absence was for a half year only.

It is apparently a common feeling that in case a professor is receiving remuneration from the college during his absence, the college should have something to say concerning the use which he shall make of his time. A number of Presidents assert that in case a professor is granted leave of absence with a remuneration, he is under obligation to return to his post and to give to the college the benefits of his outing, since the college has given him the opportunity to improve

his capabilities, has advanced the money for it, and is holding his place for him on his return. They further assert that he should not accept a call to another institution during his absence without the approval of those who have generously contributed to his success and without making sufficient financial return to the college to cover the outlay.

Some Presidents claim that members of their Faculties seem to be at a loss to know where to go and what to do when they have the opportunity to get away. One President reported the case of a professor who spent the whole period of his granted leave of absence at home, loafing about the University Club, laughing at his unfortunate colleagues who were obliged to work. Other Presidents state emphatically that if a college professor is in any sense worthy of his hire, he should be given freedom to use the time while on leave of absence as he chooses, trusting him to make the best use of his opportunities.

Apparently the majority of the colleges try to carry on the work of the absent member of the Faculty without involving any additional expense to the institution. In fact, some institutions plan to save money on the deal, as they pay half salary to the absentee and make provision for the performance of his work at a figure somewhat less than the remaining half salary. In such cases frequently an inexpensive instructor is employed to take charge of part of the work and the remainder of the work is distributed among other members of the department. Under these conditions the college can afford to grant leave of absence to only a limited number of her staff in one year. This number will depend upon the size of the Faculty, the character and the amount of the work to be done, and the possible distribution of it among the other members of the department, etc.

In institutions where the year is divided into four quarters, members of the Faculty as a rule are required to teach only three of the four periods each year. In

these institutions, if the professor is willing to teach the whole year, he is given what is called "vacation credit," amounting to a quarter for each year of such service. In this way he secures the right to be absent on full pay and for a period of time equal to that which he has given to the institution beyond that required.

Since the Commission has not had time to make a comprehensive study of the many phases of the question, and since the returns from our questionnaire are still far from complete, it would be presumptuous on our part to make any formal recommendations for the association to adopt. It may be safe, however, upon the basis of such material as we have had to work on to make a number of inferences and to present them to the Association for consideration and discussion.

1. On account of the varying conditions under which the colleges and universities are conducting their work, and on account of the great variation in their financial resources, it would be practically impossible to draw up any plan of procedure in dealing with the matter of sabbatic leave which would be acceptable to all.

2. Familiarity with the practice and ideals concerning sabbatic leave in our many different institutions should be serviceable to the individual institutions in establishing their own policies.

3. Every institution so far as its resources may permit should make some sort of provision by which members of the teaching force may be relieved of their duties at stated intervals and given an opportunity to make a change in academic climate, and through travel, study, or investigation to equip themselves for better service to the institution.

4. Both the college and the professor should look upon the plan of sabbatic leave, whatever its nature, as made primarily in the interests of the college, even though the professor is the first to receive the benefits, in the same sense that the most progressive business organizations frequently send their most trusted em-

ployees away on extensive trips with expenses fully paid, in order that these employees may become acquainted with conditions outside their own organization and thereby become better equipped for service at home. Under these conditions the professor will not look upon his granted leave of absence as a gift or as a favor but as a contract in which he is under obligation to make good use of his time and to make proper returns to the college. The authorities at the University of Arizona have just issued the following statement:

"As a recognition of efficient service and better to fit the individual for his professional work, the University shall, whenever possible, upon conditions approved by the Board of Regents, grant every seventh year as leave of absence to professors, associate and assistant professors. The acceptance of sabbatical leave involves a moral obligation to return to the University unless agreement to the contrary has been made with the President of the University and the Board of Regents."

5. College authorities should retain the right to determine the number of absentees which should be allowed in any one year, for no institution can afford to undertake the work of educating young men and women today with a teaching force in any way inadequate for the task.

6. No plan of sabbatic leave will be worth much either to the institution or to the professor which does not make generous provision for the professor's needs during his absence, for unless this is done only a very small proportion of the Faculty will be able to enjoy the privilege, since the majority of our professors can do little better than meet their yearly expenses with full salary. It must not be forgotten, too, that traveling expenses are heavier than home expenses.

7. In case a professor's health has been impaired by long and strenuous service to the college, the college should grant him leave of absence with generous re-

muneration in order that he may if possible recover his health and return to his post. Recognition of past service and the hope of service in the future should alone constitute sufficient grounds for such action.

8. In case a member of the Faculty is absent on leave and is at the same time receiving remuneration from the college, it would seem reasonable that he should not only make it a point to use his time profitably but that he should also make it a point to return to the institution in whose employ he still remains and make proper returns in the way of service, or in case the institution shall see fit to release him he should make proper financial returns to the authorities.

9. College authorities regard it a violation of trust and a misuse of the opportunities of sabbatic leave when a member of the Faculty on sabbatic leave spends the time upon work which is intended primarily for personal remuneration, particularly if he is at the same time receiving a salary from the college.

10. In case a member of the Faculty has acquired sufficient reputation to secure a call to serve as an exchange professor, the time which he takes for the performance of this work should not as a rule interfere with his right to sabbatic leave in regular course.

11. In case a member of the Faculty for any reason is unable to accept the privilege of sabbatic leave at the expiration of seven years of service, he may be entitled to the privilege at any subsequent period but under no more generous considerations as the years accumulate than are normally provided.

12. Apparently the ideal plan, the plan which every college would be glad to adopt, is the one which makes it possible for each member of the Faculty of professorial rank to be absent every seventh year and for the whole year without any reduction in pay.

13. Another plan by which each member of the Faculty of professorial rank would be given permission to be absent every fourth year for one half of the year

and without reduction in salary may appeal to some more than the first plan cited. In this case a professor would have once in every four years approximately eight months at his disposal, and would not during his tenure of office be absent from his post any longer than he would be were he given a full year of absence every seventh year.

Furthermore, an absence of fifteen months from college duties, which is possible when a professor is granted leave of absence for a whole year, is as a rule more time than he needs in one continuous period. This has been indicated by the use which some of those on long leave of absence have made of their time. Frequently professors on a year's leave of absence remain at home or about the college for several months before taking full advantage of the opportunities open to them. As frequently professors on leave of absence for a full year return home several months before their vacation is over.

14. The majority of the colleges will probably find it impossible to adopt either of the two plans just outlined because of limited resources and will be inclined to look with favor upon still another plan now in operation in a number of institutions, a plan which makes provision for the absence of each member of the Faculty of professorial rank every seventh year for a half year and without reduction in pay. This plan makes it possible for a professor to leave his post for seven to eight months, from June to February, or February to September, without reduction in his income.

15. Some provision should be made for the benefit of exceptionally promising men on the Faculty below professorial rank, which shall make it possible for them to drop their work for a year in order to pursue their studies elsewhere and to fit themselves for better service to the institution later.

16. Apparently administrative officers, particularly Presidents and Deans, are not expected to enjoy the

privileges of sabbatic leave. It is intended that they shall stick to their tasks day and night, summer and winter, until they drop in the harness. This is one of the very gratifying results of our investigation.

17. Since a very large number of the institutions which have answered our questionnaire have requested that we send to them the results of our investigation, the Association can do a very acceptable piece of work by preparing for publication and distribution such portions of the report when it has been completed as are likely to be of interest to the colleges and universities.

EDUCATION FOR SYMMETRY

PRESIDENT MORGAN, ANTIOCH COLLEGE

A few million years ago the plains of Kansas and Nebraska enjoyed a warm, moist climate, and were populated by great numbers of gigantic Saurians. Then the crust of the earth wrinkled and gradually the Rocky Mountains rose up, leaving the plains cold and dry. During this process a definite rate of adaptation was necessary if these Saurians were to survive. They had no method except the slow one of trial and error through biological mutation, and now our college professors dig their fossil bones and arrange them in museums. To have survived they would have had to introduce new methods for accelerating adjustments.

Over in Asia a similar condition occurred, at a later period. The Himalaya Mountains rose up, cutting off the warm, moist winds from the south. The elephant and the tiger made an heroic effort to conform, but passed away. They had only the old devices of the trial and error method of biological mutations. But one of the Simians added a new number to his repertoire. He began to think. His intelligence enabled him enormously to accelerate his adaptation to environment. He not only adjusted himself to the change of climate within the time limit, but became the master of creation.

The tremendous development of inventions and the consequent changes in human environment during the past century and a half are putting stresses upon human institutions in comparison with which the biological changes I have mentioned were imperceptibly slow. And to meet this stress, the existing processes for adapting human habits and institutions to changing conditions are tragically inadequate.

The standard process in determining human habits and institutions is imitation, combined with variation in detail. This process is fundamental. Children play at being like their parents. We imitate habits, institutions, fashions, manners—the almost universal method of acquiring institutions, manners, habits, beyond those that are instinctive, is by imitation and authority.

The world is crying out for an enormous acceleration of human progress. The process of imitation, of obedience to authority, of trial and error, is so slow that we sometimes wonder whether human welfare has greatly increased within historic times. Is it possible that there are shortcuts to human progress, just as the appearance of intelligence among Simians led to extraordinary shortcuts in the process of evolution? Can we depend upon the processes of imitation and obedience as controls to behavior or must we adopt fundamentally different processes which will enormously accelerate our progress toward well being? At Antioch we believe such a possibility exists, and we have committed ourselves to applying these other methods in the field of education.

The fundamental method that I believe is to bring this tremendous acceleration of progress towards well being is the application of the scientific spirit and the scientific method. As I see human progress for a long time past, ever since intelligence appeared, it has depended upon the imitation of existing institutions and existing habits and existing customs, modified little by little, by small changes. We have had, true enough,

the scientific spirit at work, but it has worked only on the margins of life in a comparatively unimportant field. It has modified tremendously our material existence. Take, for instance, the case of Germany. Germany had applied the scientific spirit and scientific method to its material affairs and its material affairs had responded tremendously. It was becoming the mistress of the world through this application, but the fatal mistake lay in this: While Germany had accepted science as a practical instrument, it was the instrument of purposes that were medieval; the old classical purposes of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, applied to the civic and national life of the people, and science was only allowed to work as an instrument for those purposes. If the scientific spirit had controlled the purposes of Germany as it did the instrumentalities, we would never have had the war. We would have had a clearness of insight that would have forever prevented it. Consider even the social and governmental policies that control us today. We still use science, not to determine our objects and purposes, but only as a means of accomplishing them. Take the upset that has come in Russia during the last few years. She used scientific methods for making cannon and running airplanes, but her political purposes were formed by the old classical, philosophic method of taking out of the blue sky a thesis and applying it wholesale, without experimental verification.

The application of scientific methods to the purposes of life would revolutionize existence.

In our colleges we recognize the scientific spirit in the chemical and biological laboratories, but here, too, it is in a little corner in the subordinate affairs of our institutions, while the purposes and the aims of these institutions are still traditional,—imitative in their methods.

The spirit of science is this: to endeavor to see what is, and to endeavor to see what ought to be. The method

of science is that of analysis, of accurate observation, of taking apart the elements of a situation to see what it is made of; accurate analysis, based on accurate observation, with control experiments; and, having the analysis complete, to make a new synthesis, a synthesis in which the necessity for trial and error has been greatly reduced by such analysis.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. Take the material field of power transmission. We have long had water power; we have made the water turn our wheels and it has ground our meal. We have had the transfer of power from the water-wheel to a shaft, and from the shaft to the mill wheel which ground our wheat. Little by little people have wanted to extend the range and use of water power, and years ago crude efforts were made to transmit water power to a distance. I remember, when a boy, seeing a water power that happened to be located about a thousand feet from a factory that needed a power supply. So the old shaft was extended across the fields, and the water wheel was actually turning the machinery in that factory through a thousand foot shaft. I remember another case where two factories were near together. The owners wished to run one on the power plant of the other, so they extended a long leather belt across the house tops over the streets to carry the power from one to the other. There they were imitating or trying to extend the same kind of experiences and methods that other men had used. That was not science. That was the imitative method of tradition.

Then men came along and made an analysis of the situation. They picked this situation to pieces and thus produced a new synthesis in which, at the power plant, they have reduced water power to the form of electric current. They carry it over great distances, two or three hundred miles, and distribute it in a great number of ways, so that our people at home run the sewing machine and cook the breakfast with it. That new

synthesis, the creation of new means of accomplishment, has extended almost infinitely the possibilities of power transmission.

The scientific spirit levies tribute on the past wherever it can. It uses existing methods and material wherever they best serve the purpose, but always under subordination to this new synthesis, with a new picture that owes no allegiance to the past.

I believe that in the field of education we must undertake the same process. It is not enough that we change a course here and there, that we add a subject here and there. We must get into the habit of making a new analysis of the meaning of life, a sort of perpetual inventory of the purposes of education, and build a new synthesis, an educational process that will accomplish these purposes.

We have undertaken to do that at Antioch. As I can not tell you in the few minutes that I have of the steps we have taken, I will only outline some of the results attained.

As to the purposes of education, as we see it, our aim is to prepare our boys and girls in the best possible way to meet the experiences which they probably will have in life. To determine that we must know three things; namely our own resources for imparting that training; the quality of the material we are working with, our students; and as nearly as possible the experiences they should be prepared for.

It is not enough that we put into the curriculum Latin, Greek, physics, geometry and biology. We must look into the probable experiences of those young people and see which of the many possible subjects of study apply in the experiences that are inevitable to them. For instance, it is universal experience that man must eat and clothe himself; he must have social contacts and work out the purposes and the fundamental aims of life. We must not forget those universal experiences.

I have, in the past twenty years, employed over two thousand technical graduates in our work. They have been given training in hydraulics, statics, railroad engineering and highway engineering, those special experiences that relate to them purely as engineers, but the wider experiences that relate to them as human beings they have not prepared for. Over and over again young engineers come to me well prepared technically, but fatally weak in their knowledge of what they are made of. Fine powers are left to go to waste, because the owners had no experience in their exercise. Sometimes young graduates are excessively over-confident. There has never been a trying-out of their powers. So, while Antioch is largely engaged in preparing people for their vocations, we say that no one may graduate at Antioch without having, as part of his training, a broad cultural education to meet the problems of life as well as the technical demands of a profession.

Another point is that we find our conventional curricula are occupied chiefly in furnishing students information, and teaching them to think. Those two items cover most of the program of our colleges. But life does not consist simply of thinking. Life includes doing, willing, undertaking. Life demands courage, initiative, resources; it demands such a knowledge of one's powers that he can get only by using those powers, and we have come to the conclusion that any educational system is fatally weak which includes only a training in knowing and thinking, and does not include a training in daring, in doing, and in all of those qualities that count in action and undertaking as well as in thinking.

So our college work is divided between work at school and work out on the job. For experience in that field we are tremendously indebted to Dean Snyder of Cincinnati University, who has blazed the way for us. That process of dividing the time of youth between knowing on the one hand, and doing and attempting and accomplishing on the other is fundamental. It is not an inci-

dent suitable only in some schools, but is an essential part of education.

Another way in which we find ourselves departing from conventional educational practice is in the distribution of time in our cultural subjects. I was looking over the exhibits here which detail the required subjects in colleges. Some of these programs are better balanced than are those of certain of our larger colleges, where a man can graduate with a single year of college science. He may on graduation be absolutely blank as to a knowledge of biology, geology, physics, or astronomy. Is not the curriculum of those schools too largely traditional? In the last century life has opened up great new fields of interest. For example, a man today loses much of the opportunity for intelligent living if he has not a fundamental knowledge of biology. For an appreciation of his relation to the physical universe, he needs astronomy, geology, physics and chemistry. We are saying at Antioch that the training wanted is not the training of the specialist. For instance, when we undertake to teach biology, we find that courses as a rule apparently are aimed to make expert biologists of the students. We don't undertake to make biologists, but we want to enable a man to understand the generally accepted principles of biology.

We have a course in general history that will enable a man to find himself in historical literature, and to acquaint himself with the forces that have made up social life in the past and that make up life today. You have seen Hendrik van Loon's book, "The Story of Mankind", or H. G. Wells' "Outline of History." Either one is a picture of what we are trying to do. Our aim is to enable the average man to find himself and his place in history with understanding of the forces that are affecting his life.

We want a man to know how other men have approached life. So we include a brief course in historical philosophy, to enable the student to see what the proc-

ess has been by which men have interpreted their relations to the outside world.

In general then, instead of giving a system of majors and minors, we are endeavoring to give our students access to the general fund of human knowledge, the time given to various subjects being brought into perspective. A general view, so long as it is concerned with the fundamentals of a subject, can be reduced to perspective, and escape being a smattering. Whether one has a general view or simply a smattering depends upon the knowledge he possesses in relation to the use he is going to make of it. Thus we are endeavoring to get a general view of the main fields of human knowledge and interest rather than a specialized insight into a few.

It happens that our students can, to a large extent, pay their way while at college.

I believe that inside of ten years, we will be able to have approximately a self-supporting institution. The aim of self-support for our students is not primarily to save money. We want students who desire to support themselves because of the training, the discipline, the knowledge of how to earn money; the knowledge of how much better it is to carry your own share of the load than to lean on someone else. Experience is the primarily valuable gain from self support, and not the incidental fact that our students can largely pay their own way.

It is another of our aims to make the student and not the course our unit. The goal at the end of the road is not a student who has had a course in physics, a course in history, a course in biology, a course in philosophy. Our goal is the synthesized personality. Possibly a quarter of our budget is spent on learning the character of the student and what experiences may enter into the preparation of that student, so that he will have trained personality.

In our vocational courses we must specialize, especially since Antioch is to remain a small school. We have tried to

find a field in which a small college such as Antioch can be most effective, more effective than any big school can be, and we have chosen as that field the training of men for proprietorship, for independent responsibility. The whole experience of our young people during their working period should help them stand on their own feet, to undertake and initiate their own projects and to become proprietors rather than employees. There are now in our country five or six million proprietors—such as farmers, store-keepers, machine shop operators, manufacturers. We have practically no educational institution that aims specifically through combined work and experience toward training for proprietorship. We have made that our job. We have tried to bend all of our special experience and training towards preparing young people to stand on their own feet. This requires that we must pick young people with a great deal of care, and we are so picking them.

The significance of Antioch, however, is not in any special undertaking, not in any special method that we undertake. It is in this fact—that we are approaching the problem not from the standpoint of picking this and that from existing institutions; not by the method of imitation, although we will imitate in detail wherever we can find anything worth imitation. Our fundamental purpose, the direction of our courses, our aims, so far as we can make them, are the processes of analysis into the fundamentals of the needs of life and the synthesis of a new process to education, which will meet those needs, regardless of any existing institution. (Applause)

PRESIDENT MORGAN: Mr. President, I have this in mind: Some time ago the Department of Labor published a number of statistics indicating the earning capacity of various percentages of the population. There were about ten per cent, I think, of the population that were getting under \$300 a year and about fifteen per cent that were getting \$500 a year, and so the scale ran on up. The United States Bureau of Education took that table and beside it they made another table which indicated that

ten per cent of the population had stopped school at below the third grade and fifteen per cent had stopped at or below the sixth grade; and this tabulation showed a complete paralleling of the earning capacity with progress in school work. The figures are given for illustration only. I do not recall them exactly.

As the bureau of education presented the matter, it seemed fairly conclusive that education and earning capacity ran together. Then there happened along one of our men who measures intelligence, and he added a third column to this table, in which he indicated that ten per cent of our population had an intelligence below ten years old, fifteen per cent had an intelligence below twelve years old, and so on through the scale. In his opinion the intelligence scale was the controlling factor, which explained the other two. I think, if we would get the intelligence rating of these students just mentioned who received high grades and the intelligence of those who had succeeded, we would possibly have found that both types of success were to some extent measures of intelligence. However, there is no question but that intelligence must be supported by other qualities of character if it is to succeed, and well balanced personality is more important than brilliancy for general life.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP

PRESIDENT F. C. FERRY

These are critical days for higher education. The colleges and universities are thronged with an unprecedented multitude of undergraduates. Classes numbering as many as 1800 members are reported to be receiving instruction all together in one of the larger institutions. In many places the groups which a few years ago were small enough to make somewhat of ef-

fective teaching possible have been replaced by classes so large as to render any classroom method save that of the lecture quite unfeasible. Naturally, it has been beyond the power of governing boards to provide increase in funds for teachers commensurate with the growth in size of classes. The greater cost of living has made larger salaries for all teachers imperative. Even if an abundance of money were provided, it is probable that the desired number of experienced and well-prepared instructors is not available in this country to secure for the present host of college youth as high a grade of instruction as was provided in the classrooms of eight or ten years ago.

Various things have conspired of late to make college education appeal much more strongly to the American public than ever before. Can the institutions of higher education perform their tasks in such effective fashion as shall enable them to retain the high regard now felt for them? It is a time of test for that profession to which we belong. Unless we can continue so to stir the intellects of the undergraduates that they shall still go out after four years,—not pleasantly adjusted to successive days of academic semi-leisure, but actually "disciplined in mind and heart for the business of life," then college education will fall from its present high position of recognized desirability. Colleges, like other organizations, will be finally judged according to their contribution to the welfare of the world.

Your Commission on Student and Faculty Scholarship believes that this is a good time for the placing of greater emphasis than ever before on scholarship. There has been much announcement of other aims of late. "Education for citizenship" and "education for service" and "education for leadership" are being proclaimed so loudly as the new and preferable goals that a college boldly offering "education for scholarship" would bring surprise. The *Times* announces changes in college curricula under the headline "Citizenship First:

Scholarship Second." The "Lampoon" asks, "Harvard or Education: Which?" The press at large prints pictures of college athletes in the dress of every sport, but pays no pictorial tribute to valedictorians or other high scholars as such. Parents tell the college officer when introducing their freshman son, "We know well that the great advantage to be gained from college is found in 'college life' and we have told John to study only enough to escape being dropped. We would be very sorry if he were to study so hard as to become a valedictorian," not realizing that the sons of such parents run no risk of winning their degrees "*summa cum laude*." Their appointed degree is "*mirabile dictu*." One should not blame John too much. He has listened to alumni who have spoken of college as a place of glorious escapades, of stealing apples, of hazing, and of hoodwinking the Faculty. Undergraduates have brought him stories of fraternity life, of house parties, and of football. He has heard that very distinguished university professor's statement, "These boys don't come to college to be educated; they come to rest their weary backs for four happy years against the sunny walls of college halls." He has read of that kindly college president who said to his undergraduates, "You may have the autumn for football and the spring for baseball if you will study in the winter." He has found his secondary school crowded with outside activities and unable to impress on its pupils much of faith in learning beyond the college requirements. It is not strange that John does not believe in the value of scholarship. It would be strange if he did. His only hope of gaining such a faith lies in his college teachers. If they tell him only that their ambition is to make him a good citizen, a man of great service to his fellows, or a leader of men, his one opportunity to learn that scholarship should be his chief concern through four years assigned to study is gone. Do we not believe "that an institution of learning which to any extent sets out to teach citizenship first and to let scholarship take care of itself,

by so much is faithless to its duty"? It seems a sound doctrine that scholarship should be a college's primary aim and that through scholarship comes the best that a college can provide for the making of good and serviceable citizens and leaders in the affairs of life. At any rate, four years of a young man's life are too many for him to give to an atmosphere which stirs his finer feelings, cultivates his athletic abilities, strengthens him in godly friendships, and does nothing more. The right kind of a country club would do all of that in his late afternoon hours and leave the working day to the serious undertakings of some business or profession.

It seems no unwarranted assumption to suppose that members of college faculties generally still believe in the cultivation of scholarship as their chief aim. They appreciate,—at least most of them do,—that they are doing most for the final good of their undergraduates if they are developing in them sound and well-trained intellects. Many a college professor is convinced that the undergraduate who excels in the tasks which he assigns day by day through four years has the largest likelihood of proving his pre-eminence in the duties of later life. Every study of the distinguished alumni of college or university points forcibly to that conclusion. Many attempts have been made to prove that it is distinction in the extra-curriculum affairs, the so-called "activities," which leads to distinction in the man's more serious subsequent undertakings, but such attempts have led to no confident conclusion and no announced findings. Yet one has been permitted to read within a half-dozen years many articles made up of sound statistical evidence in support of the argument that high scholarship in college makes for high success in life. In the first place, *Professor Walter F. Dearborn found that above eighty per cent of those who came to the University of Wisconsin from the first quarter of their high-school classes ranked

*Should Students Study? by W. T. Foster—Harper & Bros. 1917.

in the upper half of their university classes through the four years, while above eighty per cent of those coming from the lowest quarter of their high-school classes gained mediocrity or less in the university. Only one youth in nearly five hundred rose from the lowest quarter in the high school to the highest group in the university. In the great majority of cases in Wisconsin, mediocrity in high-school studies means only that or even worse in university work. Close correlation between scholarship in preparatory grades and scholarship in college has been found to exist also in Oregon and Illinois and New York. There is every reason to suppose that like results would be found in every State, for no exception has yet appeared.

Similar correlation has been found to exist between high scholarship in college and in the professional schools. Of those who through twelve years gained the bachelor's degree with high honor in Harvard College and entered the Harvard Medical School, 92 per cent were graduated with honor from the professional course. Similarly, the Harvard Law School in a period of twenty years graduated with distinction 60 per cent of those who brought degrees with highest honor from Harvard College and less than 3 per cent of that large number who had entered Harvard College with conditions and were graduated with plain degrees. More than twenty times the chance of honor in the Law School has the man from near the head of his college class as compared with the man from near the foot. Not one man in twenty years, content with so-called "gentleman's grades" in Harvard College, gains distinction in the Harvard Law School. That apostle of "college life" who "never studies between his meals" in college and who holds firm intentions of settling down to successful work in the important professional course later does not realize those good intentions once in a hundred or even once in a thousand cases,—so far as the records show.

But the correlation does not stop with the professional school. Not only is high scholarship in the preparatory school followed by high scholarship in college and that by high scholarship in the graduate and the professional school, but also, with similarly striking correlation, is high scholarship in college and university followed by high success in life. It is an old saying that the first quarter of a class at Harvard produces as many distinguished men as the remaining three quarters. One reads that two per cent of the graduates of Yale College are listed in "Who's Who in America" and that 56 per cent of the valedictorians of the same classes are listed there. Dr. Henry Van Dyke is quoted in the press as making the statement that half of the honor men of Amherst, Brown, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale have their names in that same "Who's Who in America" before they reach middle age. Dean Nicolson of Wesleyan University published a few years ago the results of a most careful and thorough study of the success in life of the members of fifty successive classes of alumni of that institution. He found that there was little variation from the rule that half of the valedictorians and salutatorians, one third of the Phi Beta Kappa men, and one tenth of those below Phi Beta Kappa gain distinguished success in life. The chance, then, at Wesleyan is one in two for the two men at the top of the class, one in three for the members of the scholarship society, and only one in ten for those below its reach. A similar study of the records of the alumni of Hamilton College gives similar results. Very like also are the statements made by Ex-President Foster of Reed College concerning studies made at the University of Oregon, the Kansas State Agricultural College, the Yale School of Forestry, Bowdoin College, Harvard College, and for the group of New England colleges generally. From Oxford University comes the same story. Among the Oxford graduates called to the bar before 1865, nearly half of the first group men and only about one in seven of the pass-

degree men achieved high distinction. Those who became clergymen showed a still higher chance for the high scholar in that profession, while no graduate ranking below the second of the five grades in the University "attained a political distinction of the highest class" in the entire period studied.

*Dean Raymond Walters of Swarthmore College has conducted a considerable investigation of a like question in the profession of engineering. After making up with much care a group of 730 eminent American engineers, he learns from their records that the chances of eminence in that profession are multiplied by eleven for those who go through college; that of all of these whose college grades were obtainable (392 in number), nearly one half were in the highest fifth and nearly three fourths were in the first two fifths of their college classes at graduation. Only one in twenty-five stood at graduation in the lowest fifth of his class. Scholastic eminence in the general studies of the college course marks the only promising roadway to engineering eminence.

To such abundant evidence of the close connection between scholarship in college and success in life, the ears of the undergraduate are peculiarly deaf. Within three months a distinguished college president remarked in a semi-public address that the worst thing about it is that the loafer in college does succeed in later life. That statement will be quite sure to gain a contented hearing from many a college idler while, statistically, it is grossly untrue. After all their attempts to prove it, the devotees of "college life" have been able to produce no general evidence, only at most an isolated case here and there. Winning games in college has yet to be shown to have any close correlation with the winning of success in life.

While the great numbers in the colleges of today establish the increased desire of the multitude to gain a

*School and Society, Vol. XIII, No. 324, Pages 322-329, March 12, 1921.

college degree, the young people do not come prompted by any new eagerness for study. They have had no favorable opportunity to develop an appreciation of the value of scholarship. Unless we can give them that appreciation, we shall have failed in one of our most important tasks. The apologetic attitude which many a college teacher shows toward his own classroom requirements may well give way and in its place appear a spirit of bold championship of scholarship. With the voice of a truthful and confident prophet, he may well proclaim the everlasting promise of high success in life for the scholarly and of failure for the unscholarly.

Granted that success in life, as ordinarily measured, is not the goal of the worthiest ambition, granted that the colleges should concern themselves with the fostering of the highest and best in human culture, it is nevertheless true that superior diligence and aptitude for knowledge lead to both the better and the best and are worthy of encouragement for practical as well as ideal reasons.

The undergraduate whose attention is demanded by countless campus activities needs and has a right to be taught that it is in the classroom and not on the athletic field that his progress towards the things which he will value most is measured. History gives abundant and striking evidence of this truth. It is time that such evidence be made to accompany football scores and baseball schedules in the thoughts of our undergraduates, and the task is ours.

THE CONGREGATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION

PRESIDENT DONALD J. COWLING

When I returned a few days ago, after an extended absence from home, I found upon my desk a copy of our program with the subject indicated assigned to me. I am not sure, Mr. President, if I had had the privilege of saying "yes" or "no", that I should have consented to speak to the Association on this subject at this time. The Congregational Foundation for Education is as yet very little more than an idea. However, it is an idea that has received very careful and extended consideration, and has recently been officially authorized by the National Council of Congregational Churches in America.

President Avery of the University of Nebraska told me, several years ago, when the Legislature of Nebraska was discussing whether they should accept the privileges of the Carnegie Foundation, that one of the representatives in the State Legislature got up and said, "Mr. Speaker, what is a foundation? I don't know what a foundation is. Is it something on which they propose to raise a superstructure against our liberties?"

I can assure the members of the Congregational group here today that this proposed Congregational Foundation for Education is not a foundation upon which we propose to erect any superstructure against the liberties of the Congregational colleges of America. There have been operative in Congregationalism from the beginning two ideas which have served as the chief guiding principles, so far as Congregational organization and administration are concerned. These are, first the idea of local autonomy,—every unit in complete charge of its own affairs, and, second, the idea of fellowship. I think those connected with Congregational colleges would be willing to confess that we have been much more successful in representing the first of these ideas, the idea of independence and autonomy, than we have been in fulfilling

the idea of fellowship. It is specifically and definitely the purpose of the Congregational Foundation for Education to increase and strengthen the fellowship between the Congregational Churches of America and the educational institutions affiliated with the denomination.

If I should undertake to suggest the considerations that were in the minds of those who were chiefly responsible for the establishment of this denominational foundation for education, I should have to refer to several very general propositions. The first is the conviction that the fundamental problems before the world today are essentially religious. If we could get the people of the world actually to accept and trust the two or three root ideas of Christianity, we should have reached a practical solution of all the great problems that face the human race today. These root ideas of Christianity are not the things that separate us as denominations; they are the convictions which we all have in common,—Protestants and Catholics alike. The teachings of Jesus have in them the secret of the solution of the problems of the world today. These teachings should be represented and interpreted and made effective by strong and well equipped educational institutions.

A second consideration is the educational situation of America today, taken as a whole. One wonders sometimes whether the Christian people of America fully appreciate the recent tendencies at work in the field of education. Prior to the past four years, about two-thirds of all the students in institutions above high school grade in America were in institutions historically associated with the churches of the country and about one-third were in institutions supported by taxes. The educational expenditures of the two types of institutions were in about the same proportion. In recent years there has been an enormous increase in the number of students attending higher institutions, and a very large percentage of this increase has gone to institutions supported by the state. There is nothing to be regretted in this

tendency until we reach about a fifty-fifty basis, but I believe it would be a distinct national loss if the tendency were permitted to go farther than that.

The educational needs of our country will be better served and our ideals more surely safeguarded by a system of checks and balances in higher education, than by a system of institutions supported entirely by the state on the one hand or by the church on the other. The Middle Ages show what happens when the church is exclusively in control, and Germany is an excellent illustration of what may be expected when the control of education is entirely in the hands of the state. There is reason to believe that if Germany had had a greater variety in her institutions of higher learning, and particularly in the matter of their financial support, the Prussian military régime would never have been able to secure a strangle hold on them as it did, and through them on the whole German system of education. There were raised up in Germany generation after generation for seventy-five years, fathers and sons inculcated with the insidious doctrines of the little coterie in power, who made their teachings effective through the best organized system of education which the world has ever seen, but which resulted in the complete breakdown of their national life and in inconceivable disaster for the whole civilized world.

America is fortunate in having its higher education carried on in part by institutions supported by the state and in part by institutions on private foundations, and if this happy feature of our educational situation is to be retained, the churches of the country must prepare themselves to support their institutions in a much more effective way than most of them have done in recent years. The establishment of the Congregational Foundation for Education represents a fresh recognition of this responsibility on the part of the Congregational Churches of America.

A third consideration that has been in the minds of at least some of those responsible for this new organization is the conviction that the denomination, as such, in recent years has permitted its sense of responsibility to be restricted almost exclusively to the weaker and comparatively unimportant institutions. We have permitted the small, ineffective, and frequently poorly managed institutions to usurp an altogether disproportionate part of the interest and imagination of the denomination. The impression has been created that these are the institutions which should be helped and that the others can take care of themselves.

The Congregational Yearbook lists some thirty odd colleges, more or less affiliated with the denomination. These institutions may be grouped into three classes. The first includes such institutions as Dartmouth, Williams, Amherst, Bowdoin, Wellesley, Smith and Mt. Holyoke,—a group of the best colleges in America. These well-established institutions have been traditionally associated with the denomination, but in recent years the denomination, as such, has felt very little responsibility for them, and as a result has rendered them very little service directly. The second group includes such institutions as Oberlin, Beloit, Grinnell, Carleton, Colorado and Pomona. These institutions insist upon their autonomy quite as much as do those in the first group, but are, perhaps, a little more ready to recognize a definite relationship to the denomination and to express a little more freely their desire for its fellowship. The third group consists of institutions which are frequently referred to as "missionary in character." They include some institutions which have been unsuccessful because poorly managed, some placed in localities with an inadequate constituency, and a few, perhaps, with a promising opportunity but with small prospect of adequate financial support in the immediate future. Most of the institutions in the third group would probably be willing to come under the direct administration and control of the

denomination if in this way their financial needs could be met. Occasionally, representatives of this group insist that only those institutions which are willing to accept direct denominational control should receive denominational support. Such a theory would, of course, be quite inconsistent with the whole history of Congregational effort in the field of education.

In the establishment of the Congregational Foundation for Education the interests of all three groups were had in mind, and it is desired to work out a national educational policy for the denomination which will apply to all types of Congregational institutions in all parts of the country. It is proposed ultimately to raise an endowment fund of at least ten million dollars and the income of the fund will be used to assist all grades of institutions according to their need and opportunity. There is no thought of control. There is not implied in the movement any criticism of the colleges. It represents chiefly a desire on the part of the denomination to have a larger share in the support of higher education in America.

No summary of the reasons which led to the establishment of this new organization would be complete without mention of our hope that the new agency may enable us to cooperate more effectively with other denominations in maintaining strong and well equipped institutions. It seems inevitable that the whole problem of denominational support for educational institutions will tend more and more in the direction of denominational cooperation in the support of better institutions.

The American college, which was established as an agency of the church, does not hold today as large a place, relatively speaking, in the public life and consciousness of the nation as it did a hundred years ago. Distinctly Christian ideas and forces in education today are comparatively ineffective because, with few exceptions, they are directly represented only by inadequate and unsatisfactory institutions. These institutions lack

public influence and leadership; they do not make a sufficiently important difference in the thinking and acting of people who carry important public responsibilities and upon whom the leadership of our nation chiefly depends.

The hope for the future lies in concentration. In the past few years there have been many instances where two or sometimes three struggling and crippled institutions have joined forces with promise of influence and power. It is to be hoped that this policy of concentration will gradually over-leap denominational lines, and bring the great churches of America into cooperation in the development and support of adequate and influential educational institutions.

The members of the Association, Mr. President, may be interested in the following summary of the action taken last July by the National Council of Congregational Churches in America in establishing the Congregational Foundation for Education:

1. Purpose:

(a) To promote the ideals of the churches of the Congregational fellowship through institutions of secondary and higher education which possess those ideals and share in that fellowship.

(b) To make available the resources of our fellowship for the counsel and encouragement of these institutions in the realization of our common purposes.

(c) To establish a permanent fund, the income of which shall be used to aid the up-building and maintenance of these institutions.

(d) To provide an agency for the study of the educational problems of these institutions and for the administration and distribution of these funds in such ways as shall best further the common interests and ideals of these institutions and our churches, by the maintenance in these institutions of high standards of educational efficiency and moral and religious purpose.

2. Name:

"The Congregational Foundation for Education."

3. Organization:

A board of eighteen trustees, six of whom shall be elected for two years, six for four years, and six for six years,—all subsequent elections to be for six-year terms. It is suggested that approximately one-third of the total number be pastors of churches, one-third educators, and one-third laymen. The Foundation shall have power to fill any vacancy in its own number until the next stated meeting of the Council.

The president of the Foundation shall be its executive officer.

The President and Trustees of the Foundation shall be elected by the National Council upon nomination by its nominating committee, unless otherwise authorized by the Council.

The following officers shall be elected annually by the Trustees of the Foundation: Chairman, Vice-chairman, Secretary and Treasurer. The Secretary and Treasurer may be elected from outside the Board of Trustees. The Trustees of the Foundation may elect such additional officers and create such committees as in its judgment may be necessary to carry on effectively the work of the Foundation.

4. Headquarters:

The headquarters of the Foundation shall be in the City of Chicago.

5. Financial Resources:

(a) The expenses of the Foundation for 1921 shall be paid out of 1921 apportionment funds raised for educational institutions.

(b) The Foundation shall be included in the 1922 apportionment for 7 per cent. of the total receipts. The President and Trustees of the Foundation shall be authorized to undertake to raise during 1922 such an additional sum as may be necessary to supplement the amount received from the 1922 apportionment to make a total current income of at least \$500,000 for 1922. It

is understood that the expenses of the Foundation shall be paid from its current income and the balance distributed among approved institutions upon such conditions as may be determined by the Trustees of the Foundation.

(c) The President and Trustees of the Foundation shall be authorized to raise during the years 1923, 1924, 1925 and 1926, for current uses as indicated in "b" above, a sum of not less than \$500,000 annually.

(d) The President and Trustees of the Foundation shall be authorized to inaugurate a movement for securing an adequate endowment and to take such steps as may be necessary to bring the movement to a successful completion. The President and Trustees, in deciding upon the endowment goal, are asked to consult as fully as possible with the State Conferences.

(e) The endowment fund shall be held in trust by the Corporation for the National Council of Congregational Churches in America, the available net income, as determined by said Corporation, to be turned over to the Trustees of the Foundation, to be used for the purposes for which the Foundation is established.

LIMITATION OF ENROLMENT IN COLLEGES

DEAN HOWARD McCLENAHAN, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The problem facing the colleges today lies not alone in the necessity for caring for greatly increased numbers: it is inherent in the motives and background of those now going to college. For, in addition to those who come for educational reasons, many come for reasons which may be good, and which are certainly compelling, but which equally certainly are not based on a love of learning. For example, some boys from New York are in college because, by sending the boy to college, the parents can rent a smaller apartment than would other-

wise be needed and an amount is saved in rental which is greater than the cost of a college course. He is, indeed, an optimist who expects that such a boy, coming to college with such motives, will be overzealous as a student.

This great influx of students may perhaps be no problem to any institution which has such resources that it can supply any number of instructors, however great, and particularly will it be no problem to an institution of great means which feels that its whole duty to its students is met when the work of the classroom is over.

However, for those colleges which are of limited means, and which in any sense feel themselves "in loco parentis," and to colleges in small towns, the marked increase of numbers presents a problem of critical importance.

In such places, the merely physical problem of housing and feeding the students properly offers difficulties of a serious character. Solely because of the numbers, students are obliged to live under undesirably congested conditions. The increased demand gives the profiteer his opportunity, and rents rise, sometimes almost prohibitively. A college course becomes, from a financial viewpoint, an increased burden and one that can hardly be borne.

To increase the teaching staff sufficiently to keep the ratio of students to instructor properly small is costly; to maintain the quality of the teaching with a suddenly increased staff is well nigh impossible.

But the greatest effect of the increase is seen when one considers the systems of self government and honor systems in examinations in those college. The changes wrought in these systems are disastrous. A president of a well known southern college told of another institution in his part of the country where an honor system in examinations had been in force for years and had been a source of benefit and a cause of pride. A great influx of academic barbarians took place; the honor system was

tried for one set of examinations, and then had to be completely given up. No system of control of student affairs which depends upon a closely knit body of college opinions and of college acquaintance can thrive under a continuation of the increases of enrolment which we have recently witnessed.

Then there is another side of this matter which is of interest, what might perhaps be called the economic side. I certainly realize some of the difficulties that are imposed by the relationship of the great state universities to the high school systems of the several states. It would be surpassingly hard to induce the state legislatures to grant powers of discrimination in admission to the state universities. Yet, when I read that in one set of examinations in one university four hundred are dropped, in another five hundred are dropped, and in a third eight hundred are dropped for deficiency in scholarship, I am appalled by the thought of the vast amount of sorrow and disappointment and mortification caused in many homes, which might have been avoided by limited admissions, and I wonder if even the rural legislators would not be affected by the economic loss involved in such wholesale failures. The cultural effect of a half year of residence in academic shades is not sufficient compensation for having hundreds of young men and women make a failure at the very outset of their lives. Both academic and public opinions have changed radically since the day when a greatly loved college president announced publicly, "It's better to have come and loafed than never to have come at all!"

It is one thing to state a problem—it is quite another thing to find the solution thereof. It is perhaps only in argumentation that the solution of a problem is found in the mere, explicit statement of the question.

Yet certain it is that the clear statement of the problem is a prime and essential step in its solution.

Our question, how can the number of students entering college be most wisely limited? How can those who

come for mental training be separated from those who come because "it is the thing to do"? How can one infallibly "separate the sheep from the goats"?

At the outset it can be said that there are certain methods by which it cannot be done wisely. It cannot be done wisely by accepting the results of entrance examinations alone. To do that is to give a marked advantage to the candidates who have been able to attend those schools which make a specialty of training for entrance examinations, like the tutoring schools, without much regard to general educational processes, and is to place a barrier in the way of those candidates who come from schools like the public high schools, where preparation for entrance examinations cannot be especially emphasized, and where the candidates must take the examinations and the preparation for them, "in their scholastic stride." To limit numbers solely by the use of entrance examinations means the acceptance of boys who have come to believe that the mere passing of entrance examinations is the "true end of man" and the perfect proof of scholastic success, and means the rejection of many a more desirable, a more ambitious, a more intellectual boy whose sole fault is that he has not been trained to meet the test of written examinations.

I am equally convinced that the limitation by exclusive use of school certificates would give just as little satisfaction as the sole use of entrance examinations.

It is a well recognized fact that schools differ greatly in the real meaning of their grades. Some schools are really thorough and grade low. Others are fairly superficial and give high marks. To accept one student with high grades from one school in preference to another student with low grades from a very different school might mean, and often would mean, the doing of an act of gross injustice. In addition to that, the lack of uniformity of conscience of different school masters is not unrecognized. Masters have told me of the pressure which has been put upon them to give certificates and

recommendations which they knew were not deserved, and yet which were granted.

Neither of these two methods alone will solve the problems of limitation.

There are, however, certain guiding principles which must be followed in any wise method of limitation. In the first place, the boy who comes to college becomes a privileged individual. It is certainly not unreasonable to expect of him that he will work at least as hard as his brother, who is not thus privileged and who goes to work in some outside occupation. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to insist that the boy who comes to college shall have shown fine application to his work and shall have shown ambition to do his work well.

In the next place, the foundation upon which all sound education must be built is good character. Unless a boy or girl is a person of good character, his danger to the community is increased by any educational process to which he is subjected. First and foremost, evidence of good character must be submitted before any candidate for admission can be considered.

In the next place, after all is said and done, the purpose of a school or college is education, is to train the mind. Other qualities are to be developed, physical well being is to be increased, and the moral sense is to be strengthened, but the great function of a school is to train the mind. Therefore, any candidate to be accepted must give evidence of mental ability. The two qualities, of good character and intellectual ability, seem to me the two fundamentals without which no boy or girl should ever be admitted to a college. This statement is perhaps a truism and yet it cannot be insisted upon too much that these two must be the prime considerations in the admission of students.

But, one asks, how are good character and intellectual ability to be determined? To this question there seems an obvious answer. They can be determined most reliably only by a consideration of all the information which

can possibly be obtained about the young person in question. School records, opinions of teachers, results of entrance examinations, records of attainment in school, whether of a literary, musical, social, athletic, or religious character, must be taken into account, and from such a wealth of information as may be available a wise decision may be hoped for.

Such decisions based upon a study of the great mass of information, can naturally be arrived at with uniform justice only by a body which devotes itself greatly to the problem in hand. This would probably mean a small group, practically constant in personnel, which should develop uniform practices and should establish standards which would be maintained from year to year. It would mean, further, that for wise decision an intimate knowledge must be obtained of the characteristics of different schools and of different school masters. There must be, then, at least some one person who can familiarize himself with schools and school men. When any really considerable number of candidates has to be acted upon, it will probably be necessary for some one officer to devote most, if not all, of his time to the question of admissions, to the establishment of school relations, to the study of methods of admission, and to the forming of opinions concerning the individual candidates. It seems necessary that there should be some such person who would serve as a director of admissions who should be the executive officer for whatever admissions board may be constituted. Such an officer and his advisory board must be given large discretionary power, under the entrance regulations of the college or university, and perhaps under such additional regulations for their guidance as the faculty may see fit to adopt. The faculty may determine the general principles to be applied. The decision in individual cases must be left to the admissions board, without pressure and without influence. Such a body would be wise to keep its faculty informed as to its actions and the reasons therefor, and would wisely con-

sider the opinions of the faculty in its decisions; yet it must, in the last analysis, be entrusted with full power to determine what candidates are to be accepted and what ones are to be rejected.

Such a board, once constituted, must formulate its policies and its rules of action and must decide upon what elements are to enter into its decisions. It seems to me that the following must be the primary considerations in any decision: Proof of good character and evidence of intellectual ability are, as has been said, the fundamentals. Other matters also of primary importance which should be taken into account in making a choice among candidates are seriousness of purpose, ambition, ability to attain results under unfavorable or difficult conditions. Matters of secondary importance which may be given consideration are qualities of leadership, athletic ability, talent in debating, or in music, or oratory, or art, geographical representation, and college affiliations of the parents. With information on all of these matters, and with any other information which may be obtained, the admission board can probably, on the whole, choose wisely and select in almost all cases those best fitted to profit greatly by a college training.

The purpose of the limitation of enrolment is, of course, largely an economic as well as an educational one. It aims to get rid of the losses involved in the present practice of what may be called universal admissions and semi-universal dismissals which is being followed throughout the country. It aims also to keep out of the colleges the dead wood—the idler, the loafer, as well as the mentally incompetent. It seeks to raise the whole intellectual tone of the college and is based upon the belief that the real progress of mankind is aided more by one Pasteur, by one Newton, by one Kant, by one Beethoven, by one Dante, by one Lincoln, by one Darwin, than by thousands of ordinary men without intellectual ambitions. It is meant to exclude those who cannot and those who can, but will not, profit by college

work—but to give every opportunity and the fullest encouragement to those who have intellects and love to use them.

I will say that we do occasionally get letters from the principal of the school, and I am glad to say, particularly from the principals of the great city high schools, and those men discriminate in the most admirable fashion in their letters to us about a boy's ability. They will say: "This boy is lazy," "This boy is a boy that has indulged in bad practices," "This one is mentally slow, but he is of good material." In getting these letters we are going to ask for letters not only from teachers, but we are going to also ask that the man, the candidate for admission shall, if possible, submit letters from persons who are known to the members of the Board, to some member of the Board of Admissions. Of course, that means usually, not always but usually, a graduate of the university, so that we shall get letters that are not in any sense purely formal letters, but letters from men we know, whose judgment we can value. So that we hope to get a much more reliable line on the boy's character than we now have at this particular time.

PROFESSOR C. M. THOMPSON, VASSAR COLLEGE

Let me begin by saying that Dean McClenahan had no need to disarm me in advance, because an attack on Princeton was the last thing I had in mind this morning. However, I am not at all certain that Vassar did "forge this bolt," if bolt it be, or that Princeton stole our thunder. I do not know that Vassar invented the policy of limiting the number of students. I do not know that it is a thing to boast of or defend. I wish to explain the conditions at Vassar, some of which I think are general and some rather particular to our own situation, which directed us to this policy of limitation.

Both yesterday and today I have been impressed in listening at these meetings to see how alike are the educational problems of both the men's colleges and the women's colleges. There is no men's curriculum and no women's curriculum, as both Dr. Kelly and President Ferry made evident yesterday. When we turn boys and girls loose, they do very much the same thing with their course of study. In the matter of admission of students also we have the same problems to meet. However, there are a few special influences, I think, that affect the domain of women. Education of a collegiate character for women goes back not very much further than the sixties. In those early years, the problem of women's colleges was not one of limitation but of expansion. The first business of college presidents, as far as I know, was to go about the country in the effort to get young women interested in college. For a time in our history the function of gathering in students was even more important than the now compelling and absorbing one of collecting endowments.

As late as the nineties, almost all social tendencies throughout the country were averse to the higher education of young women. A girl who wanted to go to college showed by her very desire that she probably was a person of more than normal intellectual ability. She certainly was a person of some determination and strong purpose to be able to strike out against the ordinary desires and ambitions of her social group. Therefore, in our early history and even through the nineties, we could have an admission system in which there was very little control, a policy of "natural selection" of the student. She selected herself and the colleges had very little to do but give her welcome. We could have a generous certificate system; we could freely encourage girls to come to college, because we knew in all probability only the right type of girl would respond to the encouragement.

About twenty years ago the inevitable social development in this country, the fine work of propaganda, and, very important also, the fact that a generation or two had lived down all the objections that had been made to college education for women, all worked together to create a strong impulse towards the sending of girls as well as boys to college. About 1905, Vassar for the first time found that it was getting more students than it knew what to do with; that is to say, more than could be readily absorbed into the educational system it had developed.

From the address by President Hopkins yesterday, from Dean McClenahan this morning, it is clear that Vassar's problem then was the same which other colleges are now facing—that of preserving a special quality in education against the onrush of quantity. One college may find that it can deal with two or three thousand, another with four or five thousand under its special conditions and not lose the purpose for which it exists. Other colleges have found that more than five hundred may threaten their characteristic quality. Princeton has judged two thousand to be the safe number; likewise Smith, I understand. The trustees of Vassar decided that a college of approximately one thousand was the most workable unit in our own special environment. With all of us the size of the college is determined primarily by the type of education that we are trying to give and by the physical circumstances under which we give it. We want to offer education not in wholesale, not in job lots, but custom made, adapted to the individual needs of each student. Most of all, we wish to teach. We want especially, in the beginning and at the end of the course, to make the relations of teacher and student as close as possible. We want to find out in the freshman year what the student is best able to do, to give supervision, direction and help, through conferences and small sections. If two hundred or three hundred more freshmen appear in any one year than were

expected, we should either have to abandon our system of instruction in small groups for mass teaching through the lecture method or else draw in at the last moment emergency instructors, less expert than the more permanent members of the staff. Either choice, we think, would make for less successful teaching than can be given with a freshman class regulated in number. With a limited number of students it is possible also to maintain a plan of work in the senior year which offers to each student the advantage of intensive study under the direction of one or more professors. Such a plan, we fear, would succumb under the weight of too rapidly increasing or fluctuating numbers.

In addition to this system of instruction there are other features of our educational plant which are best adapted to a college of moderate and fixed size. For instance, our library was built on the principle of individual work for each student. We have the alcove system, with shelves open to all workers. Our students are expected to find their own books, to make use of the entire library or such of it as they will. We have no general reading room, with reference books set aside. In history, for example, our students can work in the library as in a laboratory, selecting their own material and performing their experiments in testing the value of books. With this plan of study, the library can satisfy the needs of a student body of one thousand or twelve hundred. With more, privileges would have to be restricted and we should have to yield what we now value as our chief educational asset, free access to all books by all students at all times.

In a resident college like Princeton or Vassar, or the other eastern women's colleges, the control of the living conditions and student activities outside the classroom has long been regarded as one of the chief means of education. Dormitory space is inelastic and cannot be stretched or relaxed suddenly with the rise or fall of uncontrolled application lists. At Vassar the great ma-

jority of our students live in the college dormitories. Only a small number are outside the campus, and these are housed in cottages nearby under the direct supervision of college authorities. From our location, two miles from the small city of Poughkeepsie and with very inelastic accommodations in the scattered settlement of Arlington as our closest neighbor, it is not physically possible for us to add indefinitely to our student number and to maintain the present supervision over their living conditions.

In addition to residence quarters there are other features in our material condition which determine our size at about ten or twelve hundred. With a college of this size it is possible for the entire student body to meet together every evening for chapel services. Dramatic performances, student meetings and such activities are easily convenient in a Students' Building with a seating capacity of thirteen hundred, large enough to accommodate all the students at one time and yet within the range of the carrying power of the ordinary speaking voice. With a college unit of about a thousand we think it is possible to combine variety of type with a certain unification of purpose. With the limited college we try definitely to keep our geographical areas open, and to draw from all sorts and kinds of social and educational experience. Within a body of a thousand the dormitory and class units can be large enough to allow each student a fairly wide range of acquaintance and association.

The policy of limiting the number of students has now passed beyond the experimental stage at Vassar. It was first adopted for a five-year period, renewed for another five years, and from the satisfactory trial in ten years, the trustees voted in 1915 to continue limitation indefinitely. From alumnae and faculty as from trustees there comes no demand to abandon the practice of control in student numbers. There is little doubt, I think, that from limitation many advantages accrue to the colleges which practice it. The one drawback, possibly, is in

the sense of uneasiness we may feel in not helping to meet this extraordinary new demand for college education that has swept over the land since the war. As we contribute nothing to increase the quantity of education, all the more necessity presses upon the limited colleges to improve the quality of their product in every particular. With this opportunity of controlled experiment there is every reason why the colleges should be able to test and try out new methods of instruction and of student living to the betterment of all education.

With the principle of limitation as against indefinite expansion once established for a large number of colleges, the next immediate problem is in the method of selection of this limited number of students. Yesterday we heard President Hopkins's very interesting plan for Dartmouth, and Dean McClenahan has described Princeton's method. This question is so important that I hope very much it may form the subject for discussion at some future meeting of the Association of American Colleges. With the opportunity to share our difficulties and pool our experience we may be able to solve this problem for the best interests of the colleges of the country and of those who want our college education.

President Chamberlain: After the presentation of this most interesting topic, we ought to allow some time for discussion and we will reserve a few minutes for that. Do you wish to ask any questions or will you present the matter from the point of view of your institutions? The Chair awaits your pleasure.

President Hughes: I would like to ask what is, briefly, the method of selecting students at Vassar.

Professor Thompson: First of all, we have an examination system, but that is by no means the only measure of control. We have two different lists of applicants, from one of which we expect to admit all who fully satisfy the entrance requirements, and from the other we accept by merit, not date of application. For some years after the policy of limitation was first established

at Vassar, we continued with our old registration system, not knowing that demand for more places than we could supply was a permanent, not temporary, condition of the college. From the experience of some years, it appeared that about half the number of applicants registered in advance actually fulfilled both their intention and the entrance requirements and were ready for admission. Therefore, the registration list for each year was closed on whatever date the number reached six hundred, double the number of a normal freshman class. After the list was closed, no applications were received. In 1916 we began a competitive waiting list, known as the Honor Group. Ten places were so reserved in 1916, twenty-five in 1917, and in 1921 the competitive group was enlarged to one hundred, or one-third of the freshman class. We have not tried to evaluate mathematically the various elements of desirability, or to assign quotas to different kinds of fitness. From all the evidence before us, examinations, school records, letters of recommendation, the committee renders its composite judgment to select the best college material from the whole list of competitors. Thus far we have not found any great divergence between capable scholarship and good, vigorous qualities of leadership in character. The two seem generally to go together.

The membership of our Committee on Admission, which functions as the agent of selection, includes the President, the Dean, the Secretary of the Committee on Admission, and three representatives from the Faculty.

PRESIDENT HOPKINS, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

I am not at all certain of how general the interest is in such a proposition as Dartmouth has at the present time in her new selective process. I am not at all certain that anybody else would care to work out the problem of surplus applications along the same lines. But I have been asked to

speak this morning for a few moments in regard to the method adopted for the selection of next year's class at Dartmouth College and I am very glad to do this if it is likely to be of any advantage to anyone.

In conformity with the conditions, I suppose, at many of the American institutions at the close of the war, Dartmouth found herself faced by the necessity of either rapidly expanding, and expanding beyond all possibility of keeping up equipment and facilities and instruction corps, or of very definitely restricting, to the limit of 2,000 students, which was the maximum capacity that can be handled, on the basis of maintaining the quality of the work which she had been doing. Of course, there were a number of ways in which this restriction could take place. It could take place either upon the basis of an examination system and picking the possible number from men of the highest grades, or it could be done on the basis of priority. However, the applications increased in volume to such an extent that it did not seem even reasonably satisfactory to adopt either one of these alternatives. Two years ago Dartmouth had something over 1,000 more applications than she could accept. Last year she closed her list four months early, on the first of May, with still more requests for admission in hand, and this year we have already in hand several applications to every one that we can possibly accept, applications which represent conformity with the scholastic requirements.

President Richmond has said to me that another way of meeting the proposition would be to eliminate all men who had conditions, but that is not satisfactory to us, because Dartmouth College draws from forty-three or more states each year, and we draw from a considerable number of schools the quality of whose work is high, but which are unable to meet one or another of the units of requirements for local reasons; yet the men from these come well qualified and we would prefer

to have them to some men from other schools who would not be conditioned, but would be lower in their averages.

I think I should speak for a moment on the situation at Dartmouth, and I should state in passing that this selective process, as it has been eventually worked out, is not something that has sprung full panoplied from the brain of anyone, but is an evolution, the present form of which has been worked out by an exceptionally able group, at the forefront of which was Professor E. Gordon Bill, Director of Admissions. Dartmouth has seventy-six per cent. of her men from the public schools of the country. The college likewise represents another rather interesting feature, in that Dartmouth is not the predominant interest in any preparatory school of the country, and the men who come to Dartmouth from the preparatory schools are a large group of school minorities of small dimensions. For instance, in the last entering class of six hundred and two men, three hundred and fifteen schools are represented and the maximum delegation from any school outside of Hanover is ten from Philips Exeter.

Now, it was desired to perpetuate in the undergraduate body of Dartmouth, which should be enrolled under this system, those qualities of the old college which we had found desirable and which we believed to be valuable to the undergraduate—we wished to preserve the idea of regional distribution; we wished to preserve, just as distinctively, the distribution in the social state, that is to have the cross-section of all classes of society. We wished to safeguard another thing which we feared ourselves to be very rapidly losing, that is, we wished to preserve the variety of types of homes from which the men come.

We were very strongly of the conviction in the analysis of our situation, that there was a perceptible enough question how to get intellectual potentiality, so that we were not willing to commit ourselves wholly to the proposition that those men who had shown themselves

to be only rank getters should be accepted as the exact equivalent of men of high intellectual potentiality. We find in the college, for instance, at the present day that a number of the highest ranking men are men who have come from the preparatory schools without the distinctive rank in the preparatory school which would indicate what they could do.

When the lists close on April 1, therefore, there will be two things which can be done immediately with the list of applications which are before us, namely, to eliminate from the group that considerable number who, though scholastically prepared, either on the one hand are of low general average, or on the other hand are so weak in one particular point that it seems certain that the college work could only be carried with the greatest difficulty.

On the other hand, we shall have gathered the data which will define those men of outstanding scholastic ability, and by outstanding scholastic ability we mean not only the men capable of getting high grades, but men so possessed of intellectual capacity that they demonstrate this in anything to which they give their attention. This is the type of man whom the principal says is a man of marked intellectual capacity and in regard to whose work it always appears that it is attacked with that mental vigor and intellectual curiosity which sometimes is so definitely demonstrated in men of preparatory school age.

The number so admitted as of outstanding intellectual promise will not in the very nature of things be large,—not nearly so large, indeed, as we wish it might be—and not nearly as large as it would be if we were accepting marks alone as significant.

Of about equal importance in our minds will be that group of men whose scholastic record shows them to be adequately prepared, while their other credentials demonstrate that they are men of positive qualities of character or with marked capacities for leadership.

However definitely the college might be able to create the spirit of scholarly research in its men, its work would necessarily lose much in effectiveness if it were to forego the presence of that type of man through whose influence in the world men are influenced to become positive forces for good and to take an active interest in affairs rather than a passive.

There is still another group of active and flexible minded boys from whom the college is desirous of getting its quota in order to preserve the factors in college life which such men always contribute, and in order to insure the impossibility of a standardized type within the college,—that is the group who with good scholastic standing have demonstrated an active interest in various forms of school life.

These are the essential factors in the system that from those men available through applications for admission to Dartmouth we wish to select the men of outstanding intellectual capacity, the men of outstanding character with reasonable intellectual attainments, and the men with wide interests who, perhaps, have sacrificed the possibility of maintaining the highest ranks in order to have contact with, or to participate in, more different things.

We likewise assume complete understanding of our constituency with the provision that the sons of Dartmouth men who present proper qualifications scholastically and of good character, shall be admitted without question. Dartmouth College is an historic colonial college in the New England north country. Its graduates in some cases represent successive generations, and the college wishes to preserve within its body the atmosphere and the influence of these men.

Likewise, it wishes to preserve the factor of geographical distribution. Since in the natural course of things it has been found that the men who come from the long distances are likely to average higher in initiative and determination, and since for the sake of the widest possi-

ble contacts, it is desired to interpose no obstacles that make it difficult for these men removed from intimate touch with the college to come to Dartmouth, we have provided for the time being that all applications of men scholastically prepared from west of the Mississippi River and south of the Mason and Dixon line, shall be accepted.

Complementary to this, we are likewise expecting to take the entire group of those qualified who apply from New Hampshire, since New Hampshire is the home state of the college and since its men are in a particular sense men of the Dartmouth neighborhood.

Finally, there is one added provision in regard to which there has perhaps been more curiosity than in regard to anything else connected with the project, namely, that attention shall be given to the vocational background of the homes from which the students come. This provision is designed again to break up any tendency toward a standardized group and to insure that the college shall have not only the sons of business men, for instance, but likewise the sons of professional men, and the sons of farmers, while at the same time it is to be insisted that we do not sacrifice that group of serious-minded men who under the necessity of earning their own way seek help from the college in the form of scholarships.

Occasional question has arisen among our own men in regard to this provision, and the query has reasonably been made why we should open our doors to any man incapable of paying the whole of his own way, when numbers of men were doubtless available among the applicants for Dartmouth who would be amply capable of meeting all expenses.

Of course, this argument only has a superficial appearance of being sound, so long as it should remain true that these men would not be denied an education by any exclusion

of ours, but simply would be denied the privilege of enrollment at Dartmouth.

I have felt, however, that the situation in regard to the college was very much like that of the London churches in the old story told by Spurgeon, who had preached on missions in his great London church. Asked after the sermon if he believed that the heathen of Central Africa would go to hell if the London churches did not send them missionaries, he replied that he did not know about the heathen of Central Africa, but that he felt sure that the London churches would. I do not feel that it is so vital to that purposeful type of man who gets his college education by combined work and scholarship help whether he comes to Dartmouth or not, as it is to Dartmouth that this type of man shall not be lost from its undergraduate constituency.

Now, to anyone who is interested, I would say that the system is not as complex, nor as doctrinaire as it sounds when I stand up here and undertake to describe it. In regard to any single man we have the scholarship credentials from the school; we have the data in regard to his type of character and the facts in regard to variety of interest from the blank submitted to cover these details, aside from all of the letters of personal testimonial.

We do not claim for the system infallibility or omniscience—we simply present it as a working hypothesis for the solution of a problem under which Dartmouth College is constrained to accept only a small proportion of those who apply for admission, and desires, of course, to accept that group which will best preserve all that is strong and desirable in the undergraduate life of the college, who will tend to strengthen it at all weak points.

Of course any such description as I have undertaken to give in this brief statement is insufficient as a description of the working processes by which the system is to

be administered, and I will simply say, in closing, that the college will be exceedingly glad to give the results of its experience at any time to any institution or individual who may be interested in this experiment.

THE RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

GEORGE F. ZOOK

Specialist in Higher Education, U. S. Bureau
of Education.

In compiling the statistics of the universities, colleges and professional schools, it has been the custom of the Bureau of Education to list the number of students attending the higher institutions in each of the States. The increase in this number from year to year has been interpreted as an index of the willingness of the people of any State to support higher education through legislative appropriations and private endowments and as an evidence of the growing proportion of its residents who attend colleges and universities.

Nevertheless, from time to time, it has been pointed out correctly that a ranking of States according to this method is by no means a dependable index either of the willingness of the people of the State to support higher education or, more certainly, of the number and proportion of the citizens of any State who attend colleges and universities. For example, it has always appeared strange that with its excellent system of secondary schools, New Jersey should be ranked last in college attendance per population, because it chanced to contain no institutions of higher learning of great size, and only three of moderate size.

It has, therefore, been apparent for some time that an attempt should be made to secure accurate statistics concerning the residence of college students. Such an inves-

tigation has twice before been conducted, for the years 1887-88 and 1896-97, by Mr. L. A. Kalbach, now the chief clerk of the Bureau of Education. In this table all students above high school grade were included with the exception of professional and normal school students, who were carefully excluded.

In the investigation, the results of which are herewith presented, it has seemed wise to include all professional students with the exception of those from the independent theological seminaries. Also, the first table does not include teachers' colleges and normal schools, which will be referred to later. The returns from the institutions of higher learning were practically complete, a happy condition secured through the courtesy and cooperation of the men and women whom I have the honor to address. I have considerable confidence, therefore, in the situations which the statistics seem to reveal.

The second table shows the total number of the residents of each state in the Union who are in attendance at universities, colleges, and professional schools in any part of our country. With this information, it is possible to find the proportion of people in each State who are in college. The States have been ranked and it appears that, excluding the District of Columbia, Oregon leads the States, with one college student for every 112 people, and Iowa and Utah follow, with 128 and 137, respectively. (Table II—second column.) It should be a source of considerable pride to the Westerners that the first twelve States on the list are distinctly Western States. It is apparent that the people of that region realize the value of higher education. Tennessee is at the bottom, with 604 citizens for each college student, and Arkansas and New Mexico follow, with 566 and 509, respectively. In this connection, it is interesting to note that of the last twelve States, all but one are commonly regarded either as Southern or border States. In fairness to the Southern States, however, it should be said that there is other evidence gathered last year by

the Bureau of Education which shows that college attendance in those States is increasing faster than in any other region of the country. The New England and Middle Northern States, containing in general the largest and most famous institutions, occupy the middle ground.

In view of the diversity of practice among the several States concerning the support of teachers' colleges and normal schools, it has seemed wise to add a table containing these students and to rank the States accordingly. For institutions of this type the Western States lead again, the first ten on the list, with the exception of Indiana, being distinctly Western States. (Table III—column 2.)

In some States the teacher training institutions are, as in Utah, merged with the State university. In others they have been less developed. In order that the situation for institutions of higher learning as a whole may be appreciated, Tables II and III have been combined to make Table IV. When this is done, Kansas, Oregon, Washington and Iowa lead in point of students to population, and Maryland, Tennessee and Arkansas bring up the rear. (Table IV—column 2.)

Another interesting result which has come out of this study is to ascertain what proportion of the students residing within any State are cared for in the institutions of higher learning located within that State. (Table II—columns 3, 4, 5.) In this connection, there is no clear tendency, though the three far Western States of California, Oregon and Utah lead, while New Jersey foots the list, holding only 18.2 per cent. of her students within her borders. Evidently the educational attractions of Philadelphia and New York City are too much to be resisted. Connecticut, with Yale University, follows. There are, indeed, six States, New Jersey, Idaho, Connecticut, Wyoming, Delaware and Kentucky, where more than one-half the students matriculate at institutions located in other States.

In the combined table (Table IV) it appears that California, Michigan and Kansas lead in the proportion of their students educated in their own institutions. Wyoming, Connecticut and New Jersey take care of the smallest proportions of their students.

It would not be out of place, perhaps, for any of the States located in the second half of this table to ask themselves whether sufficient facilities for higher education have been established and maintained within their limits to provide for the legitimate demands of their citizens. In this connection it might be well for some western missionaries to establish a few colleges back where colleges first began, in the Eastern States of New Jersey and Connecticut, in order to provide adequate higher education facilities for their sons and daughters. On the other hand, some one will contend, I am sure, that it is a fine thing for Eastern students to go abroad in the land.

The Eastern States, however, may point with pride to the fact that in general they possess the colleges and universities to which students from other States resort most heavily. (Refer to last column of Table II.) Massachusetts, New York, Illinois and the District of Columbia lead in point of numbers, although taking the number of students residing within a State as an index of what may reasonably be expected of it and comparing this number with the number of students actually matriculated at institutions within the State, it appears as if the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maryland, Illinois, Nevada, Virginia and Michigan lead the other States in the order named. Nineteen States are educating in their colleges and universities more students than come from these respective States; the other forty educate less than they furnish.

The proportion of college and university students who leave their respective States for an education is 25.1%; that for teachers' colleges and normal schools, 7.6%. It is evident, therefore, that normal school students seldom

leave the State in which they reside for their education. Those in Arkansas, Oregon and Vermont, for some reason find it desirable to go in considerable proportions, though in no great numbers, to other States, while few if any normal school students from outside States resort to the teachers' colleges and normal schools in Arkansas, Mississippi, Vermont, Connecticut, Maryland or New Jersey. On the other hand, the teachers' colleges and normal schools of Alabama, New York and Massachusetts attract large portions of their students from outside their boundaries.

One of the interesting results of this study has been to reveal for the first time the total number of students above high school grade attending colleges and universities for last year. The total number here given is 448,267. Adding the 93,846 students above high school grade in teachers' colleges and normal schools, we get a total of 542,113.

Another interesting result is that for the first time accurate statistics on the number of foreign students in American colleges and universities have been secured. The number is 6,901. Including for a moment the 333 foreigners in teachers' colleges and normal schools we get a total of 7,234 foreign students of collegiate grade in the United States. In addition to these there are 1,456 students from American possessions outside the United States in universities and colleges, and 29 in teachers' colleges and normal schools. The numbers in the universities and colleges are as follows: Philippine Islands, 857; Porto Rico, 302; Hawaii, 208; Alaska, 60; Canal Zone, 25; Virgin Islands, 3; Guam, 1.

The total number of students from foreign countries and American possessions in all types of our higher institutions amounts to 8,719. China leads with 1,487, and the other important countries follow in order: Canada, 1,405; South American countries, 578; Japan, 534; Russia, 301; India, 241; Great Britain, 159; France, 167; Germany, 27.

Statistics are barren without interpretation. What does it signify, for example, that Kansas has one student in higher institution for every 97 people of the State and Arkansas one to every 511? What are the implications from the fact that certain States prepare such a large percentage of their students in their own institutions while others prepare only a small per cent? What does it matter that the total number of college students has increased from 346,000 in 1917-18 to 450,000 in 1920-21, or 30%? What may we expect from the fact that more than 7,000 foreign students are now in our higher institutions, not to mention the nearly 1,500 from American possessions?

All these things are clear proofs of advancing appreciation of higher education in this country. They show conclusively that the people of this country believe in higher education as a necessary preparation for making a living and for living a life. Will this rush to the colleges continue? When one considers the tremendous increase in the number of secondary school students pushing up from below there seems no doubt of it. At any rate we can confidently expect those States where there is a low percentage of college students to the population to approach, within a few years, the high level already attained by the other States in the Union.

This large increase in the proportion of our people who invest in higher education should make us pause to consider two things, (1) how shall we pay the expense of giving a higher education to this increasing proportion of our population, and (2) what educational readjustments are demanded to take care of the changed condition in education? The time is inadequate to discuss either of these propositions. However, I may say that to me the increased expense has no terrors. Higher education is no luxury, no dead expense. It returns to the individual and to the nation many times the money which is invested in it. With increased investments in higher education goes as a corollary increased ability

to pay for it to the same degree that the geometric ratio exceeds the arithmetic.

This observation holds true only if educational efficiency and economy are constantly practiced, a statement which brings me to the second significant point raised by the great increase in student attendance at colleges and universities. What educational readjustments are demanded to take care of the changed condition? May I venture a few, what appear to me, nearly self-evident suggestions? The eight-year elementary school was developed in this country as a finishing school. Neither in the early days of the Republic nor now has it been intended to prepare students to go to college. As long as only a very small proportion of the boys and girls went on to preparatory school and college it is not strange that little or no notice was taken of their special needs. May we not today, however, maintain that the increase in the proportion of those who go on to higher institutions justifies some attention to their educational wants? In other words, may we not soon take a leaf from the century-old experience of European countries and begin our college-preparatory education after the completion of a six-year elementary school? There will then be opportunity for the first time in the history of our secondary schools actually to finish a college-preparatory course.

This program of educational efficiency should be linked with another program of equal if not greater importance. The secondary schools in this country began as college-preparatory schools. The last half century has seen an unparalleled growth in this field, and with it an insistent demand for vocational education ending with high school graduation. By yielding to this demand the close connection formerly existing between the secondary schools and the higher institutions has suffered an estrangement amounting in some States practically to divorce. Now with so great an increase in the proportion of those who go to college, with the country better able financially

than at any time in the past to support higher education, with the possibility of material and cultural progress so dependent on higher education, is it not apparent that there should be such a reorganization as will permit boys and girls definitely to prepare for college and university work without preventing others from preparing for vocations at the end of the high school course? To accomplish this change we need the consolidation of small high schools and a revival of the doctrine that the secondary course of a boy who goes on to college should prepare him definitely to do college work.

But whatever be the shortcomings of our system of education, we may justly view with pride the growing disposition amounting now almost to a passion on the part of foreign students to matriculate in American higher institutions. Scarcely a week passes by that we do not have inquiries at the Bureau of Education from prospective foreign students who earnestly wish to come to America. The 7,000 foreign students now in our higher institutions may not in all instances find educational facilities superior to those in their own country, but they are at least available to practically every young man and young woman of ability. And, what is of prime importance, is the fact that here better than anywhere else in the world foreign students learn that higher education is not the prerogative of aristocracy, that it is for all classes and conditions of people alike, and that service including manual labor if necessary as a means of making a living or of earning one's way through college, is a badge of honor respected equally by faculty and students. This is the lesson of democracy which foreign students as zealous missionaries are carrying back to their native countries with such power as to make certain that American higher institutions are helping to raise not only our own country but the whole world to a higher level of democratic citizenship.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Education GFZ Washington
THE RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS January 11, 1922
 By GEORGE F. ZOOK
 Specialist in Higher Education
 Bureau of Education.

TABLE I.
 Residence of College Students (excluding professional and normal school students), 1896-7*

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each College Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING COLLEGE IN THE STATES IN WHICH THEY RESIDE			Number of Students Attending College Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
Nevada	155	268	134	86.5	2	143
California	3,347	425	3,094	92.4	1	3,548
Massachusetts	5,416	471	4,463	82.4	13	8,225
Rhode Island	777	506	587	75.6	29	995
Oregon	741	511	620	83.7	10	640
Maine	1,277	513	874	68.4	33	1,019
Vermont	646	515	335	51.9	44	425
Kansas	2,422	549	2,092	86.4	3	2,333
D. C.	497	551	232	46.7	45	635
Iowa	3,618	577	2,802	77.5	24	3,084
Connecticut	1,399	585	797	57.0	40	2,495
South Dakota	606	662	475	78.4	23	513
Ohio	5,754	670	4,513	78.4	22	5,331
Minnesota	2,412	680	2,072	85.9	6	2,418
New Hampshire	569	684	234	41.1	48	563
Washington	701	684	588	83.9	9	623
Colorado	784	694	603	76.9	25	755
Nebraska	1,488	747	1,269	85.3	7	1,461
Illinois	5,699	791	4,141	72.7	30	5,757
Utah	327	791	266	81.4	15	302
Michigan	2,829	792	2,398	84.8	8	3,078
Indiana	2,831	809	2,280	80.5	17	2,981
Delaware	205	845	77	37.6	49	94
New York	7,873	854	5,235	66.5	36	7,355
Pennsylvania	6,874	865	5,280	76.8	27	6,605
Wyoming	112	890	75	67.0	35	80
Maryland	1,257	922	858	68.3	34	1,642
Tennessee	1,969	943	1,701	86.4	4	2,569
North Carolina	1,838	959	1,580	86.0	5	1,783
South Carolina	1,251	1,004	987	78.9	19	1,068
Louisiana	1,200	1,028	965	80.4	18	1,008
Virginia	1,641	1,034	1,276	77.8	21	1,779
New Jersey	1,641	1,046	747	45.5	46	1,755
Wisconsin	1,934	1,062	1,526	78.9	20	1,823
Missouri	2,771	1,084	1,978	71.4	31	2,291

TABLE I—(Continued)

Residence of College Students (excluding professional and normal school students), 1896-7*

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each College Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING COLLEGE IN THE STATES IN WHICH THEY RESIDE			Number of Students Attending College Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
Idaho	128	1,120	57	44.5	47	64
Montana	165	1,272	86	52.1	43	93
Kentucky	1,537	1,297	1,182	76.9	26	1,399
Florida	369	1,303	232	62.9	37	253
Texas	2,251	1,323	1,873	83.2	12	1,962
Mississippi	1,074	1,332	823	76.6	28	871
Arizona	58	1,351	32	55.2	42	35
Georgia	1,444	1,395	1,165	80.7	16	1,216
North Dakota...	217	1,399	122	56.2	41	144
Alabama	1,207	1,416	1,007	83.4	11	1,239
West Virginia...	562	1,511	326	58.0	39	430
Arkansas	828	1,534	679	82.0	14	712
New Mexico...	88	2,014	54	61.4	38	68
Oklahoma	101	2,715	71	70.3	32	71

*These statistics were compiled by Mr. L. A. Kalbach, now Chief Clerk of the Bureau of Education.

Percentage of students attending college in the State in which they reside, 76.5; median, 76.9 per cent.

TABLE II.

Residence of students in Universities, colleges and Professional Schools (excluding independent theological schools and teacher training institutions, 1920-21)

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING COLLEGE IN THE STATES IN WHICH THEY RESIDE			Number of Students Attending College Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
D. C.	4,600	96	3,381	73.5	25	9,718
Oregon	7,020	112	5,992	85.3	2	8,015
Iowa	18,867	128	14,853	78.7	13	17,068
Utah	3,283	137	2,741	83.5	3	3,276
Kansas	11,786	151	9,335	79.2	9	10,494
Nebraska	8,607	151	7,042	81.9	5	8,261
Washington ...	8,780	155	6,936	79.0	11	8,588
Nevada	465	167	341	73.3	26	559
California	20,481	168	18,417	89.9	1	22,460
Colorado	5,302	178	3,928	74.1	23	6,226

ASSOCIATION OF

TABLE II—(Continued)

Residence of students in Universities, Colleges and Professional Schools
(excluding independent theological schools and teacher training
institutions), 1920-21

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING COLLEGE IN THE STATES IN WHICH THEY RESIDE			Number of Students Attending College Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
Idaho	2,383	182	1,102	46.2	45	1,304
Minnesota	12,983	184	10,519	81.0	7	12,561
Montana	2,972	185	1,902	64.0	32	2,191
Indiana	15,548	189	11,246	72.3	27	14,911
South Dakota...	3,379	189	2,090	61.8	36	2,322
Ohio	29,617	195	23,508	79.4	8	28,222
Vermont	1,724	205	1,070	62.1	34	1,671
New York.....	49,282	211	40,036	81.2	6	55,130
Wyoming	906	215	393	43.4	47	493
Illinois	28,887	225	22,683	78.5	14	34,935
New Hampshire	1,865	238	945	56.0	42	2,848
Massachusetts ..	16,072	240	11,924	74.2	22	24,136
Missouri	13,996	244	10,947	78.2	15	14,101
Connecticut	5,568	248	1,985	35.6	48	4,738
Michigan	14,757	249	12,285	83.2	4	17,208
Wisconsin	10,603	249	8,295	78.2	16	11,710
Pennsylvania ...	34,491	253	27,412	79.2	10	36,262
North Dakota...	2,523	256	1,512	60.0	38	1,792
Maine	2,966	259	1,917	64.6	31	2,391
Oklahoma	7,709	264	5,918	76.7	19	6,356
South Carolina..	6,250	270	4,922	78.8	12	5,517
Rhode Island...	2,173	279	1,346	61.9	35	2,184
Arizona	1,174	284	835	71.1	28	1,171
New Jersey.....	10,744	294	1,957	18.2	49	4,199
Virginia	7,296	317	5,374	73.7	24	8,626
Delaware	699	320	316	45.2	46	402
West Virginia..	4,490	326	2,722	60.6	37	3,249
North Carolina..	7,720	332	5,875	76.1	20	6,902
Mississippi	5,078	346	3,287	64.7	30	3,482
Texas	12,800	365	9,918	77.5	17	10,575
Florida	2,588	374	1,528	59.0	40	1,780
Maryland	3,402	427	1,892	55.5	43	4,319
Louisiana	4,156	933	3,121	75.1	21	4,333
Alabama	5,299	443	3,680	69.4	29	4,354
Georgia	6,078	477	4,670	76.8	18	6,614
Kentucky	4,857	498	3,042	62.8	33	3,730
New Mexico....	709	509	330	46.5	44	504
Arkansas	3,094	566	1,830	59.1	39	2,020
Tennessee	3,874	604	2,197	56.2	41	4,359

Percentage of students attending college in the State in which they reside, 74.3;
median, 73.5.

TABLE III.

Residence of students in Teachers' Colleges and Normal Schools, 1920-21.

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE IN WHICH THEY LIVE			Number of Students Attending Institu- tions Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
Kansas	6,532	271	6,396	97.9	2	6,830
Washington	2,874	472	2,792	97.1	4	3,146
Indiana	6,159	476	5,991	97.2	3	6,096
Oklahoma	4,066	499	3,901	95.9	9	4,109
Minnesota	4,365	545	4,042	92.6	20	4,259
Wisconsin	4,418	596	4,264	96.5	7	4,532
New Mexico....	600	601	576	96.0	8	663
Idaho	698	619	584	83.6	34	651
South Dakota...	887	717	792	89.2	23	902
Colorado	1,169	804	1,088	93.0	19	1,212
West Virginia...	1,803	812	1,746	96.8	6	1,809
Michigan	4,311	851	4,120	95.5	10	4,239
Texas	5,454	855	5,097	93.4	17	5,197
Missouri	3,908	871	3,478	88.9	24	3,622
California	3,701	927	3,588	96.9	5	3,871
North Dakota...	652	991	513	78.6	36	583
Louisiana	1,660	1,084	1,515	91.2	22	1,536
Illinois	5,869	1,105	5,576	95.0	11	5,883
Virginia	2,033	1,135	1,914	94.1	15	2,012
New Hampshire	376	1,179	318	84.5	30	342
Mississippi	1,513	1,183	1,322	87.3	26	1,322
Arizona	271	1,230	205	75.6	38	226
New Jersey....	2,388	1,322	1,865	78.0	37	1,866
Maine	558	1,377	482	86.3	28	490
Pennsylvania ...	6,202	1,407	5,868	94.6	13	5,999
Oregon	517	1,516	307	51.3	43	322
Massachusetts ..	2,357	1,643	2,212	93.8	16	2,599
Tennessee	1,410	1,658	1,298	92.0	21	1,500
Iowa	1,425	1,687	1,203	84.4	32	1,279
Kentucky	1,421	1,701	1,324	93.1	18	1,336
D. C.....	251	1,744	212	84.4	31	222
Rhode Island....	326	1,854	309	94.7	12	322
Connecticut	741	1,864	620	83.6	33	621
Nebraska	678	1,911	581	85.6	29	620
Montana	274	1,999	184	67.1	41	190
New York.....	5,018	2,070	4,883	99.5	1	7,047
Alabama	1,004	2,330	940	94.4	14	1,899
Ohio	2,371	2,430	2,093	88.2	25	2,309
South Carolina...	653	2,578	540	82.6	35	573
Vermont	127	2,775	67	52.7	42	67
Georgia	1,023	2,830	772	75.4	39	775
Maryland	428	3,387	373	87.1	27	374
Arkansas	378	4,633	130	22.4	44	130

ASSOCIATION OF

TABLE III—(Continued)

Residence of students in Teachers' Colleges and Normal Schools, 1920-21

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE IN WHICH THEY LIVE			Number of Students Attending Institu- tions Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
North Carolina..	434	5,891	306	70.5	40	314
Wyoming	40	4,861	49
Nevada	13	5,955	47
Delaware	23	9,261	45
Utah	48	11,881	48
Florida	23	9,261	45

Percentage of students attending institutions in the State in which they reside, 92.6; median, 88.2.

TABLE IV.
Residence of Students in Higher Institutions (except independent
Theological schools, 1920-21.)

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING HIGHER INSTI- TUTIONS IN THE STATE IN WHICH THEY LIVE			Number of Students Attending Higher In- stitutions Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
D. C.	4,851	91	3,593	74.0	26	9,940
Kansas	18,318	97	15,731	85.8	3	17,324
Oregon	7,537	104	6,299	83.5	6	8,337
Washington	11,654	117	9,728	83.4	7	11,734
Iowa	20,292	119	16,056	79.1	19	18,347
Indiana	21,707	136	17,237	79.4	18	21,007
Utah	3,321	136	2,741	82.4	10	3,276
Minnesota	17,348	138	14,561	83.9	4	16,820
Colorado	6,471	139	5,016	77.5	22	7,438
Nebraska	9,287	1,140	1,623	82.1	12	8,881
Idaho	3,081	141	1,686	54.7	44	1,955
California	24,182	142	22,005	90.9	1	26,331
South Dakota..	4,266	150	2,882	67.5	34	3,224
Nevada	478	162	341	71.3	29	559
Montana	3,246	169	2,086	64.2	37	2,381
Oklahoma	11,775	173	9,819	83.3	8	10,465
Wisconsin	15,021	176	12,559	83.6	5	16,242
Ohio	31,988	181	25,601	80.0	16	30,531
Illinois	34,756	187	28,259	81.3	14	40,818
Vermont	1,851	190	1,137	61.4	39	1,738

TABLE IV—(Continued)

Residence of Students in Higher Institutions (except independent Theological Schools, 1920-21)

STATES	Number of Students from the Several States	Number of People to Each Student	STUDENTS ATTENDING HIGHER INSTI- TUTIONS IN THE STATE IN WHICH THEY LIVE			Number of Students Attending Higher In- stitutions Within the State
			Number	Percentage of Total Number from the State	Rank of State	
Missouri	17,904	191	14,425	80.5	15	17,723
New York.....	54,300	192	44,919	82.7	9	62,177
Michigan	19,068	193	16,405	86.0	2	21,445
New Hampshire	2,241	198	1,263	56.3	43	3,190
North Dakota..	3,175	204	2,025	63.7	38	2,375
Wyoming	946	206	393	41.5	47	493
Massachusetts ..	18,429	210	14,136	76.7	23	26,735
Pennsylvania ...	40,693	215	33,280	81.7	13	42,261
Maine	3,524	218	2,399	43.4	46	2,881
Connecticut	6,309	219	2,605	41.2	48	5,359
Arizona	1,445	231	1,040	71.9	28	1,397
West Virginia...	6,293	233	4,468	70.9	30	5,058
New Jersey....	13,132	241	3,812	29.0	49	6,065
Rhode Island...	2,499	242	1,655	66.2	35	2,506
South Carolina..	6,903	244	5,462	79.1	20	6,090
Virginia	9,329	248	7,288	78.1	21	10,638
Texas	18,254	256	15,015	82.2	11	15,772
Mississippi	6,591	272	4,609	69.9	31	4,804
New Mexico....	1,309	276	906	69.2	33	1,167
Delaware	722	309	316	43.8	45	402
Louisiana	5,816	310	4,636	79.7	17	5,869
North Carolina..	8,154	314	6,181	75.8	25	7,216
Florida	2,666	363	1,528	57.3	41	1,780
Alabama	6,303	373	4,620	73.0	27	6,253
Kentucky	6,278	385	4,366	69.5	32	5,066
Georgia	7,101	408	5,442	76.6	24	7,389
Maryland	3,830	431	2,265	59.1	40	4,693
Tennessee	5,284	443	3,495	66.1	36	5,859
Arkansas	3,472	511	7,960	56.4	42	2,150

Percentage of students attending institutions in the State in which they reside, 76.1;
median, 75.8.

ASSOCIATION OF

TABLE V.

Residence of the students who attend colleges, universities and professional schools in the several States, 1920-21.

STATE	Total Number of Students Attending Institutions	Number of Students from the State	Percentage of Total	Number of Students from Other States	Percentage	Number of Students from Foreign Countries and American Possessions	Percentage of Total
New Hampshire...	2,848	945	33.1	1,886	66.2	17	.7
Dist. of Columbia...	9,718	3,381	34.7	6,049	62.2	288	3.1
Connecticut	4,738	1,985	41.8	2,671	56.3	82	1.9
Maryland	4,319	1,892	43.8	2,281	52.8	146	3.4
New Jersey.....	4,199	1,957	46.6	2,160	51.4	82	2.0
Massachusetts	24,136	11,924	49.4	11,410	47.2	802	3.4
Tennessee	4,359	2,197	50.4	2,100	48.1	62	1.5
Nevada	559	341	61.0	207	37.0	11	2.0
Rhode Island	2,184	1,346	61.6	831	38.0	7	.4
Virginia	8,626	5,374	62.3	3,174	36.7	78	1.0
Colorado	6,226	3,928	63.0	2,232	35.8	66	1.2
Vermont	1,671	1,070	64.0	589	35.2	12	.8
Illinois	34,935	22,683	64.9	11,267	32.2	985	2.9
New Mexico.....	504	330	65.4	166	32.9	8	1.7
Georgia	6,614	4,670	70.6	1,884	28.4	60	1.0
Wisconsin	11,710	8,295	70.8	3,244	27.7	171	1.5
Arizona	1,171	835	71.3	318	27.1	18	1.6
Michigan	17,208	12,285	71.3	4,444	25.8	479	2.9
Louisiana	4,333	3,121	72.0	1,101	25.4	111	2.6
New York.....	55,130	40,036	72.6	13,627	24.7	1,467	2.7
Oregon	8,015	5,992	74.8	1,847	23.0	176	2.2
Indiana	14,911	11,246	75.4	3,374	22.6	291	2.0
Pennsylvania	36,262	27,412	75.5	8,259	22.7	591	1.8
Missouri	14,101	10,947	77.6	2,999	21.2	155	1.2
Delaware	402	316	78.6	85	21.1	1	.3
Wyoming	493	393	79.7	98	19.8	2	.5
Maine	2,391	1,917	80.1	463	19.3	11	.5
Washington	8,588	6,936	80.7	1,328	15.4	324	3.9
Kentucky	3,730	3,042	81.5	658	17.6	30	.9
California	22,460	18,417	81.9	3,407	15.1	636	3.0
Ohio	28,222	23,508	83.2	4,256	15.0	458	1.8
Utah	3,276	2,741	83.6	495	15.1	40	1.3
Minnesota	12,561	10,519	83.7	1,900	15.1	142	1.2
West Virginia.....	3,249	2,722	83.7	503	15.4	24	.9
North Dakota.....	1,792	1,512	84.3	271	15.1	9	.5
Alabama	4,354	3,680	84.5	649	14.9	25	.6
Idaho	1,304	1,102	84.5	195	14.9	7	.6
North Carolina....	6,902	5,875	85.1	990	14.3	37	.6
Nebraska	8,261	7,042	85.2	1,179	14.2	40	.6
Florida	1,780	1,528	85.8	242	13.5	10	.7
Montana	2,191	1,902	86.8	275	12.5	14	.7
Iowa	17,068	14,853	87.0	1,998	11.7	217	1.3

AMERICAN COLLEGES

177

TABLE V—(Continued)

Residence of the students who attend Colleges, Universities and Professional Schools in the Several States, 1920-21

STATE	Total Number of Students Attending Institutions	Number of Students from the State	Percentage of Total	Number of Students from Other States	Percentage	Number of Students from Foreign Countries and American Possessions	Percentage of Total
Kansas	10,494	9,335	88.9	1,109	10.5	50	.6
South Carolina....	5,517	4,922	89.2	577	10.4	18	.4
South Dakota.....	2,322	2,090	90.0	218	9.3	14	.7
Arkansas	2,020	1,830	90.5	189	9.3	1	.5
Oklahoma	6,356	5,918	93.1	428	6.7	10	.2
Texas	10,575	9,918	93.7	609	5.8	48	.5
Mississippi	3,482	3,287	94.3	191	5.4	4	.3

ASSOCIATION OF
PROFESSORIAL SALARIES

J. J. TIGERT, the U. S. Commissioner of Education

I have glanced back at the bibliography of articles appearing in the two decades just previous to the World War and noted the tone of those touching upon the subject of salaries in colleges and universities. The overwhelming majority of these articles imply that professorial pay was totally inadequate. An editorial in the "Nation," December, 1903, undertook to show that college salaries were insufficient to keep the strongest men in the colleges but maintained that a reasonable increase would suffice to hold them because they did not demand luxuries and enjoyed other compensations in addition to the remuneration. This editorial is fairly typical. Many of the articles imply further a certain lack of public esteem for the professorial calling. George Trumbull Ladd, in the "Forum," in 1902, writes of the "degradation of the professorial office." An article in the "Atlantic Monthly," in May, 1905, set out a list of thirty-one necessary items of expense for a professor with a family and from these the author undertook to show the inadequacy of salaries at that time and the necessity for improvement.

Going back a little further, in September, 1893, nearly thirty years ago, a writer in the "Forum" gave a statistical review of professors' salaries in 124 American colleges. The author contended that the American professor had too many responsibilities, too many demands made upon him and required an average salary of \$2,000 rather than the \$1,400 per year he was receiving at that time. A surprising number of the articles make comparisons between conditions in the United States and Germany which one would hardly dare make today for fear of the charge of Pro-Germanism. An exceptional writer, here and there, expressed the conviction that salaries were quite adequate and voiced the unusual opinion that the salaries were determined by principles of economics.

and that every man received what he was worth. For example, under the caption, "Confessions of an Obscure Teacher," a writer in the "Atlantic Monthly," September, 1906, took the very surprising and optimistic view that his salary of a little less than \$2,000 was quite sufficient for all his needs. Nevertheless, as we said, the prevailing feeling all through the years has been that professorial salaries are inadequate. We think that is still the consensus of opinion.

Nor is this opinion confined to America. Listen to the words of the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, England—"They do not pay in this country—nor in any other—their professors or their university presidents enough. . . . Well, it is the old, old story: The cheapest thing going today, says the satirist, is education. I pay my clerk, said Crates, four pounds a year, but a philosopher can be hired for about sixpence, and a tutor for three half pence. So today, writes Erasmus, a man stands aghast at the thought of paying for his boy's education a sum which would hardly buy a fool or hire a farm-servant. Frugality! It is another name for madness."

Figures compiled by the Chief Clerk in the Bureau of Education and published in Bulletin 1920, No. 20, offer some comparisons between the remuneration of college professors and other workers. (See Table, p. 185.)

It will be seen that in 1919, associate professors were slightly better paid than structural iron-workers who were better paid than professors in private institutions; that carpenters and painters were paid about the same as assistant professors in State institutions but much better paid than assistant professors in private institutions; that machinists were paid about the same as assistant professors in private institutions; that instructors in State institutions received less than hod carriers and about the same pay as railroad yard employees, while instructors in private institutions were paid almost to the dollar the same as hostlers and engine-house men.

Doubtless, those of my hearers who are employed by colleges do not require arguments to convince them that professorial salaries are not high. You would very much prefer to hear something more specific with reference to the effects of the War and the prospects of the future.

The United States Bureau of Education gathers statistics annually with reference to salaries in State universities and colleges. Some comparisons of pre-war and present salaries might be illuminating and interesting.

Salaries of Presidents.

In the collegiate year 1913-14, just previous to the outbreak of the war in Europe, the average salary of the Presidents of the State institutions was \$5,249. In 1919-20, the average salary of the same men had risen to \$6,663, an increase of 26.9%. In neither case are allowances made for residences which were given in addition to salary. However, the number who were given houses were 48 presidents out of 84 reporting in 1913-14 and 57 out of 88 reporting in 1919-20, or an increase of those having residences given them from 57% to 65%.

In 1921-22, the present year, we asked the Presidents to estimate the value of the rent of the houses given in addition to the salary and to add it to the salary. In this way, we arrived at an average salary for the current year of \$8,861 from 74 reporting. This would be an increase of about 69% over the average for 1913-14 but no estimate was made of houses in that year. In 1920-21, when no houses were considered, the average president's salary was \$7,524 or an increase of 43.3% over 1913-14.

We would be safe in saying that presidents' salaries in State institutions have risen since 1913-14 up to the present in the neighborhood of about 50%.

Salaries of Faculties.

The salaries of faculty members rose more rapidly than did the salaries of Presidents in the State institutions. This was probably due to the fact that those nearest the

margin of greatest need in meeting the greatly increased cost of living were attended to first and presidents came in later for increases. This assumption is fortified by the fact that Presidents' salaries arose on the average of only 26.9% in 1919-20 over 1913-14 but in 1920-21 and 1921-22, they rose 43.3% and about 50% respectively over 1913-14. Thus the increases were relatively much greater in the last two years. Further, Presidents' salaries rose in the State institutions 28% from 1915-16 to 1920-21 which was considerably less than the average increase for members of the faculty. The salaries of normal school presidents rose from 1916-17 to 1919-20 only 11.8% whereas all ranks of faculty members were much more favored with increases.

The following figures gathered by the Bureau of Education indicate what has happened in the matter of increases in salaries of the faculties of State universities and colleges between the year 1915-16, the year just previous to the entrance of the United States into the war, and the present collegiate year of 1921-22.

	Average Salary 1915-16	Average Salary 1921-22	Per cent of In- crease
Dean	\$3,062	\$4,250	38.8
Professor	2,400	3,392	41.3
Associate Professor	1,926	2,800	45.4
Assistant Professor	1,603	2,300	43.5
Instructor	1,184	1,800	52.0

In citing these figures, it must be noted again, as was the case in computing increases in salaries of presidents, that no allowances was made for houses in 1915-16 whereas houses were taken into consideration in 1921-22. This fact probably makes the estimated increase for deans and to a less extent, for professors a little too high but could hardly affect appreciably those below the rank

of professor. But even if the percentages for deans and professors are not too high, the figures show very clearly that the greatest relative increases have come to those in the lower positions who draw the smaller salaries.

Salaries in Normal Schools.

In this connection, it might be interesting to call attention to some comparisons between salaries in Normal Schools and State Universities and colleges, which were brought out by Dr. George Zook, the Bureau's Specialist in Higher Education, in August, 1920. This study showed that in the year 1919-20 the average annual salary of professors in normal schools was about equal to the average salary of an assistant professor in a State university or a college and about \$250 less than the average salary of a full professor in a privately supported university or college. On the other hand, instructors in normal schools received an average salary of \$250 per year more than instructors in private universities and colleges and about \$150 less than instructors in State universities and colleges.

Those Leaving the Profession during the War Period.

Some will be interested to know what effect did the war period have in alluring men from the professor's chair to other callings and to what extent those who made the change were benefited financially. On March 1, 1920, the Bureau of Education listed 21 instances of college and normal school teachers who in the few years just preceding left teaching for other occupations. Any-one desiring the complete list and figures can read them in *SCHOOL LIFE* for that date or secure them from the Bureau. We shall be content to say here that the average teaching salary of the 121 persons who changed occupations was \$1,826 and that the average salaries or earnings of the same 121 persons in their new occupations was \$3,647 or an average increase in earning power of 99.7 per cent over their old positions as teachers. It

would be exceedingly difficult to find an equal number of persons who went from other vocations into teaching during those years at an average increase of 100% over previous remuneration though, of course, one sees that the large increase which those leaving the teaching profession received was due in great part to the general rise which was taking place in the period in the remuneration for all professions and all workers of every kind. At any rate, those figures are a good rebuttal to the one who maintains that all wages are fixed by economic laws and that every one gets just what he is worth and no more or less.

**Some Comparative Percentages of Increase in Salaries,
Prices and Wages since 1913.**

	1920	1921
Retail Food Prices	103%	45%
Wholesale Food Prices	136%	33%
Cost of Living	100%	80%
Laborers' Weekly Wages	130%	—
Artisans' Weekly Wages	102%	—
Wholesale Commodities	143%	51%

These figures, together with those already given on salary increases, reveal conclusively that professorial salaries increased much less during the war period than did the price of food, the cost of living, the wages of artisans or the wages of laborers. The prices of food and the cost of living have fallen considerably in the last two years. During the war period the college professor, like most salaried persons, suffered tremendously but today he is perhaps in as good a position economically as he was before the war. If he is not, he soon will be because the cost of living will doubtless continue to fall but there is not likely to be much drop in professorial pay. If the cost of living returns to anything like

the pre-war level, though it is not likely to go down to the same level except at some distant time, then we may expect that the college professor will ultimately gain from the war because it is hardly conceivable that the present level of salaries in colleges and universities will be forced down very much, in view of the admitted inadequacy of such salaries in the past.

Teachers in Universities and Colleges	Average Salary 1919	Employees in Mechanical Industries	Yearly Earnings 1919
PUBLIC			
Professors.....	\$3,126	Structural Ironworkers.....	\$2,379
Associate Professors.....	2,514	Carpenters.....	2,081
Assistant Professors.....	2,053	Painters.....	2,078
Instructors	1,552	Road Train Employees.....	1,946
		Machinists.....	1,777
		Hod Carriers.....	1,565
		Railroad Yard Employees.....	1,421
		Hostlers and Engine-house Men.....	1,204
PRIVATE			
Professors.....	2,304
Associate Professors.....	2,423 ✓
Assistant Professors.....	1,770
Instructors.....	1,205